

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

EDITED BY

M. PLATNAUER, M.A., B.Litt.

AND

W. K. C. GUTHRIE, M.A.

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

PROF. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., F.B.A. (<i>Chairman</i>), representing the Cambridge Philological Society		
J. G. BARRINGTON-WARD, M.A. (<i>Hon. Treas.</i>)	PROF. J. F. DOBSON, M.A. } Representing the	
PROF. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A., F.S.A.	F. H. SANDBACH, M.A. (<i>Hon. Sec.</i>) } Council of the	
PROF. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A.		Classical Association

E. A. BARBER, M.A., F.B.A. representing the Oxford Philological Society

With the co-operation of

PROF. E. K. RAND, *Harvard University*, PROF. J. L. MICHIE, *University of Queensland*,
and PROF. B. D. MERITT, *Institute of Advanced Study, Princeton*

VOLUME XXXVII

OXFORD

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD

1943

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NUMBERS 1, 2

Alcaeus of Messene, Philip V, and Rome (<i>concluded</i>). F. W. WALBANK . . .	I
An Early Source of Polis-constitution. VICTOR EHRENBURG . . .	14
The Days for Consulting the Delphic Oracle. H. W. PARKE . . .	19
A Fragment of Parthenios' <i>Arete</i> . R. PFEIFFER . . .	23
Five Passages in Sophocles. A. Y. CAMPBELL . . .	33
Criticism of Individuals in Roman Popular Comedy. R. W. REYNOLDS . .	37
Ritual Elements in the New Comedy. GILBERT MURRAY . . .	46
ΥΠΗΡΕΤΗΣ. L. J. D. RICHARDSON . . .	55
The Spartan Rhetra in Plutarch <i>Lycurgus VI</i> . A. Plutarch's Text. H. T. WADE-GERY . . .	62

NUMBERS 3, 4

Polybius on the Roman Constitution. F. W. WALBANK . . .	73
Tacitea. G. B. A. FLETCHER . . .	90
ΗΡΑΚΛΗΣ ΛΕΟΝΤΟΦΟΝΟΣ (Theocr. <i>Id.</i> xxv). A. S. F. GOW . . .	93
Some <i>Cucurbitaceae</i> in Latin Literature. F. A. TODD . . .	101

I
4
9
3
3
37
6
55
62

73
90
93
OI

THE C
For

T

V

Pric
tion

JUL 1 1943

V37 # 1/2

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. *Jan 1943*
 For the present, THE QUARTERLY will be published in two DOUBLE numbers in April and October;
 the times of publication of THE REVIEW are variable under war conditions

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

EDITED BY

M. PLATNAUER, M.A., B.Litt., Brasenose College, Oxford

W. K. C. GUTHRIE, M.A., Peterhouse, Cambridge

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., F.R.S. (Chairman), representing the Cambridge Philological Society

J. G. BARRINGTON-WARD, M.A. (Hon. Treas.) Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A.
 Prof. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A., F.R.S. F. H. SANDRACH, M.A. (Hon. Sec.) } Representing the Council of the
 Prof. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A. } Classical Association

E. A. BARBER, M.A., F.R.S. representing the Oxford Philological Society

With the co-operation of Prof. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, Prof. J. L. MICHIE, University of Queensland,
 and Prof. B. D. MERRITT, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

Volume XXXVII

JAN.—APRIL 1943

Numbers 1, 2

CONTENTS

ALCAEUS OF MESSENE, PHILIP V, AND ROME (concluded). F. W. WALBANK . . .	1
AN EARLY SOURCE OF POLIS-CONSTITUTION. VICTOR EHRENBERG . . .	14
THE DAYS FOR CONSULTING THE DELPHIC ORACLE. H. W. PARKE . . .	19
PARTHENIOS' ARETE—A NEW ATTRIBUTION. R. PFEIFFER . . .	23
FIVE PASSAGES IN SOPHOCLES. A. Y. CAMPBELL . . .	33
CRITICISM OF INDIVIDUALS IN ROMAN POPULAR COMEDY. R. W. REYNOLDS . . .	37
RITUAL ELEMENTS IN THE NEW COMEDY. GILBERT MURRAY . . .	46
YTHPETHE. L. J. D. RICHARDSON . . .	55
THE SPARTAN RHETRA IN PLUTARCH LYCURGUS VI. A. Plutarch's Text. H. T. WADE-GERY . . .	62

OXFORD: AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE

HUMPHREY MILFORD: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Price for single numbers, 4s. net (4s. 2d. post free); for double numbers, 8s. net (8s. 4d. post free). Yearly subscrip-
 tion 16s. post free; U.S.A. \$3.40. Combined yearly subscription for THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and
 THE CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. post free; U.S.A., \$5.32.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
331468B

The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by

† T. E. PAGE, C.H., LLT.D.
E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D. W. H. D. ROUSE, LLT.D.
L. A. POST, M.A. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A.

Founded by JAMES LOEB

ARTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
Footslop 8vo, 400-700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net; leather, 12s. 6d. net

A series of Greek and Latin Texts with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is
in control of all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the
Western Empire.

"We shall never be independent of our Loeb."—*Times Literary Supplement*

NEW VOLUMES, 1942-1943

LATIN

348, 349 CICERO. DE ORATORE, DE FATO, PARADOXA STOICORUM, PARTITIONES ORATORIAE. Two
volumes. Translated by E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham.

352 PLINY. NATURAL HISTORY. Ten volumes. Vol. II, Books III-VII. Translated by H. Rackham.

GREEK

364 DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS. ROMAN ANTIQUITIES. Seven volumes; Vol. IV, Books
VI, 49-end, and VII. Translated by E. Cary.

365 JOSEPHUS. Nine volumes; Vol. VII, ANTIQUITIES, Books XII-XIV. Translated by R. Marcus.

366 ARISTOTLE. GENERATION OF ANIMALS. Translated by A. L. Peck.

Machine or Mind? (an introduction to the Loeb Classical Library). Free together with *Descriptive
Prospectus, &c.*

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, LTD.

Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

CLASSICAL BOOKS

As of all subjects we hold a
very large stock of Classical
Books both new and second-
hand. Owing to paper restric-
tions we are not able to issue
our usual catalogues but we
will gladly answer all enquiries.
We are anxious to purchase
good Classical Books as well as
good books in every field of
Literature, Science and Arts



W. HEFFER AND SONS LTD
4 PETTY CURY, CAMBRIDGE

LARGE DEPTS. FOR BOOKS ON ART,
POLITICS, EDUCATION, RELIGION,
ETC.

FOYLES
+ BOOKSELLERS TO THE WORLD +

New and secondhand Books
on every subject

Stock of nearly three million
volumes

BOOKS BOUGHT

Join the Classics Book Club!
Members buy world-famous
books published at 7/6, 10/6,
and 12/6 for ONLY 2/6

119-125 Charing Cross Road
London, W.C.2

Telephone:
Gerrard 3660 (16 lines)

Open 9-6 including
Saturday

I
 anon
 201 1
 Phil
 uph
 follo
 into
 offic
 Phil
 whic
 that
 even
 the
 216—
 case
 end
 Epic
 chro
 orth
 I
 denc

¹ C
 n. 136
graec.
 ix. 5
 p. 134
 a sup
² S
 Aratu
 I sugg
 with
 (Livy
³ C
 n. 136
⁴ S
 'Nach
⁵ A
 comm
 mülle
⁶ T
 be m
 Kaibe

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

JANUARY—APRIL 1943

ALCAEUS OF MESSENE, PHILIP V, AND ROME

(concluded)

III. ALCAEUS' CHANGE OF ALLEGIANCE

From what has already been said it will be clear that Alcaeus of Messene, like the anonymous author of *Anth. Pal.* xvi. 6, was a supporter of Philip V at least until 201 B.C., that is, until the Second Macedonian War. The view that his breach with Philip followed the Messenian events of 215–214 has, however, been so frequently upheld that it deserves consideration.¹ It appears to be based on one or more of the following assumptions. Philip's activities in Messene resulted in driving that state into the Aetolo-Spartan camp: Alcaeus, as a loyal Messenian, will have followed the official Messenian policy. Further, Alcaeus wrote a poem (*Anth. Pal.* ix. 519) accusing Philip of poisoning his guests: this is to be connected with the death of Aratus, in which the Achaean himself professed to see the hand of Philip.² Finally, it is assumed that Alcaeus had already started his literary career at the time of the Messenian events of 215–214, since he has left an epigram celebrating the threefold victory at the Isthmus of the famous Cleitomachus of Thebes, whose *floruit*, it is claimed,³ was 216–212 (*Anth. Pal.* ix. 588). None of these arguments is really cogent: a very good case can be, and has been, made out⁴ for dating Cleitomachus' success towards the end of the third century; the poisoning referred to is undoubtedly that of Callias and Epicrates (cf. *Anth. Pal.* xi. 12)⁵ which, being itself undated, cannot be used as a chronological index; and politically Alcaeus, as we shall see, was far from being an orthodox Messenian.⁶

It is clear, however, that the breach took place before Cynoscephalae. The evidence is in the following epigram:

Ἀκλαυστοὶ καὶ ἄθραπτοι, ὁδοιπόρε, τῷδ' ἐπὶ νώτῳ
Θεσσαλῆς τρισσαὶ κείμεθα μυριάδες,
Αἰτωλῶν δημηθέντες ὑπ' Ἀρεῶς ἢ δὲ Λατίνων,
οὓς Τίτος εὐρείης ἤγαγ' ἀπ' Ἰταλίας,

¹ Cf. Knaack ap. Susemihl, op. cit. ii. 545, n. 136; Bergk, *Philol.* xxxii, 1873, 678; *Poet. Lyr. graec.*⁴ iii. 196. Those who regard *Anth. Pal.* ix. 518 as ironical or hostile (see *CQ.* xxxvi, p. 134, n. 4) usually deny that Alcaeus was ever a supporter of Philip.

² So Stadtmüller, ed. Teubner, ad ix. 518. Aratus' death was in 213. In *Philip V*, 79, n. 2, I suggested (wrongly, I believe now) a connexion with the murder of Chariteles of Cyparissia (Livy (Pol.), xxxii. 21, 23).

³ Cf. Knaack ap. Susemihl, op. cit. ii. 545, n. 136.

⁴ See C. Wunderer, *Philol.* lvii, 1898, 1–7; 'Nachtrag', *ibid.* 649.

⁵ *Anth. Pal.* xi. 12. 1 is referred to by Schol. B, commenting on *Anth. Pal.* ix. 519; see Stadtmüller, ad loc.

⁶ Two other supposed pieces of evidence must be mentioned. Many scholars have seen in Kaibel, *Epig. ex lap. coll.* 790 (from Dyme;

= Hiller v. Gaertringen's *Hist. griech. epig.* 105) a work of Alcaeus (e.g. Kaibel, ad loc.; Knaack ap. Susemihl, op. cit. ii. 545, n. 135; Reitzenstein, *P-W*, s.v. 'Alkaios' (13), col. 1506; Friedländer, *AJPh.* lxiii, 1942, 82): but the attribution is uncertain, and, as Seeliger points out (op. cit. 15, n. 16), it can merely show that Alcaeus may have been a supporter of Philip when it was written. Since, moreover, the dedication mentioned may be either before or after the restoration of Dyme (cf. Livy (Pol.), xxxii. 22. 10), the poem is useless for chronology. Another epigram by Alcaeus (*Anth. Pal.* vii. 412) deals with the death of Pylades, the *citharoedus*; but this merely proves that Alcaeus was writing after Philopoemen's second *strategia* (206–205: cf. G. Niccolini, *La confederazione achea* (1914), 286–7; A. Aymard, *Les premiers rapports de Rome et de la confédération achaienne* (198–189 av. J.-C.) (1938), 43, n. 64), when Pylades made an appearance.

Ἡμαθίη μέγα πῆμα. τὸ δὲ θρασὺ κείνο Φιλίππου
πνεῦμα θοῶν ἐλάφων ὥχετ' ἐλαφρότερον.

(Plut. *Flam.* 9. 2; cf. *Anth. Pal.* vii. 247.)¹

Plutarch states that this poem was composed after Cynoscephalae,² and being widely repeated gave more offence to Flamininus than to Philip, who merely replied with a characteristic parody.³ There are two possible reasons for this. One is that lines 3-4 gave offence because they mentioned the Aetolians first. Since this is the account of Plutarch himself, it has been generally accepted.⁴ If it is correct, the absence of the offending lines from the *Anthology* is most likely to be explained as due to their excision by Alcaeus when he found that they were being given an interpretation which he did not intend.⁵ However, this raises a difficulty, which is brought out by a suggestion of Stadtmüller. Alcaeus, he thinks, deleted the two offending lines, and then employed the pentameter in a poem praising Flamininus as the liberator of Hellas (*Anth. Pal.* xvi. 5):

Ἀγαγε καὶ Ξέρξης Πέρσαν στρατόν Ἑλλάδος ἐς γᾶν,
καὶ Τίτος εὐρείας ἄγαγ' ἀπ' Ἰταλίας,
ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν Εὐρώπῃ δοῦλον ζυγὸν αὐχένι θήσων
ῥήθεν· ὁ δ' ἀμπαύσων Ἑλλάδα δουλοσύνας.

But it is surely hard to imagine behaviour more tactless than to embody—purposely⁶—in a poem in Flamininus' honour a line which must constantly have reminded him of a distasteful incident; and there is little evidence that Alcaeus found the composition of pentameters so laborious as to necessitate it.

There is a more likely explanation. Plutarch's account probably derives from some collection of stories;⁷ and this may well have preserved the fact that Alcaeus' epigram gave irritation to Flamininus, and yet have invented the explanation that this was because it mentioned the Aetolians first (a plausible notion in view of the recorded clash between Flamininus and the Aetolians).⁸ It is therefore probable that Alcaeus wrote the poem in its *Anthology* form, and so irritated Flamininus by the complete omission of any reference to the identity of the victor, rather than by the order in which he and the Aetolians were mentioned.⁹ The object of such a poem must have been to insult Philip (as Plutarch says),¹⁰ not to praise the conqueror. Subsequently,

¹ The version in the Palatine Anthology omits lines 3-4, which were restored from Plutarch by Brunn and Hecker.

² The Macedonian dead remained ἀθαρτοί until Philip of Megalopolis buried them in 191 (cf. *Philip V*, 200, n. 4); Plutarch's remarks and the argument adduced below suggest, however, that the epigram was written very soon after the battle.

³ Plut. *Flam.* 9. 3 (= *Anth. Pal.* xvi. 26 B); the mock epitaph, *Anth. Pal.* ix. 520, is probably also the work of Philip. Plutarch's words (9. 2) are: μάλλον ἤνία τὸν Τίτον ἢ τὸν Φίλιππον.

⁴ Plut. *Flam.* 9. 1: ὥστε καὶ γράφεσθαι καὶ ἀδεσθαι προτέρους ἐκείνους ὑπὸ ποιητῶν καὶ ιδιωτῶν ὁμολογῶν τὸ ἔργον. Cf. Seeliger, op. cit. 16; Reitzenstein, *P-W*, s.v. 'Alkaios' (13), vol. 1506; A. Klotz, *Rh. Mus.* lxxxiv, 1935, 47; Walbank, op. cit. 173.

⁵ Stadtmüller, ad loc., suggests two other possibilities: that lines 3-4 were an insertion by a pro-Aetolian poet or that they were omitted through the error of a scribe at some later date.

The latter event is too much of a coincidence to be plausible; and the identity of line 4 with line 2 of *Anth. Pal.* xvi. 5 is against the former suggestion.

⁶ So Körte, op. cit. 400.

⁷ See H. Nissen, *Kritische Untersuch. über die Quellen der vierten u. fünften Dekade des Livius* (1863), 280-90.

⁸ Livy (Pol.), xxxiv. 41. 5-7; 49. 5-7; xxxv. 12. 15; 48. 12; Plut. *Flam.* 8-9.

⁹ In the six-line version, lines 3-4 are an awkward interruption between the reference to the τρισσαί μυριάδες and the ambiguous comment Ἡμαθίη μέγα πῆμα, which may now refer either to the loss of the 30,000 (accusative in apposition to the sentence) or to the Latins brought by Titus (accusative in apposition to οὗς). Bowra follows a sound poetic instinct when he gives the epigram in its short form in the *Oxford Book of Greek Verse*, No. 557, in contrast to Körte, op. cit. 400 n., who believes that the omission 'lessened the effectiveness of the poem'.

¹⁰ Plut. *Flam.* 9. 3: τοῦτο ἐποίησε μὲν Ἀλκαῖος

for reasons to be considered, the poet composed *Anth. Pal.* xvi. 5 in praise of Titus, and at the same time inserted lines 3-4 into vii. 247; in both cases the common line served the positive purpose of *praising* the Roman general.

This explanation of the incident, which seems altogether more natural, not only solves the difficulty of the repeated pentameter; it also removes the only evidence for the theory that after his breach with Philip Alcaeus linked himself with the Aetolian cause, or even went to reside in Aetolia.¹ Rather it suggests that Alcaeus, after leaving the Macedonian camp, passed through a period of purely negative hostility to Philip, which only later gave way to a new enthusiasm for Flamininus and Rome. If we may follow a suggestion of Niese,² this enthusiasm is reflected in the *Συγκρίσεις*, or *Comparisons*, which Alcaeus wrote against the grammarian Isocrates, who was later to become famous as a prominent enemy of Rome.

What then was the cause of the breach with Philip, which took place between 201 and 197? On this subject we have no explicit information. What is certain is that Alcaeus' hostility finds its expression in two poems so bitter that they cannot be very far removed from the source of the quarrel. These poems, which accuse the king of being a monster who poisons his guests in their cups, deserve a closer examination than they have yet received; they have a good deal to tell us about Alcaeus, and perhaps even more about Philip.

IV. THE CYCLOPS AND THE CENTAUR

Πίομαι, ὦ Αἰναιεῖ, πολὺ πλεόν ἢ πῖε Κύκλωψ
νηδὺν ἀνδρομέων πλησάμενος κρεάων·
πίομαι· ὥς ὄφελόν γε καὶ ἔγκαρον ἐχθροῦ ἀράξας
βρέγμα Φιλippeῖς ἐξέπιον κεφαλῆς,
ὅσπερ ἑταιρείοιο παρὰ κρητῆρι φόνοιο
γεύσας· ἐν ἀκρήτῳ φάρμακα χενάμενος.³ (*Anth. Pal.* ix. 519.)
Οἶνος καὶ Κένταυρον, Ἐπίκρατες, οὐχὶ σέ μόνον
ᾤλεσεν ἡδ' ἐρατὴν Καλλίου ἡλικίην.
ὄντως οἰνοχάρων ὁ μονόμματος, ᾧ σὺ τάχιστα
τὴν αὐτὴν πέμψας ἐξ Αἰδεω πρόποσιν. (*Anth. Pal.* xi. 12.)

ἐφυβρίζων Φίλιππῳ καὶ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἀποθανόντων ἐπιψευδόμενος, λεγόμενον δὲ πολλαχοῦ καὶ ὑπὸ πολλῶν μᾶλλον ἢ τὸν Τίτον ἢ τὸν Φίλιππον. Plutarch does not say that Alcaeus intended to praise the Aetolians.

¹ Seeliger, *op. cit.* 14; and, following him, Walbank, 74 'from his refuge in Aetolia'. Klotz, *Rh. Mus.* lxxiv, 1935, 47, n. 1, would connect Alcaeus' exaggerated figure of 30,000 Macedonian dead (which also appeared in Valerius Antias as 40,000, and in Claudius as 32,000: cf. Livy, xxxiii. 10. 8) with an Aetolian source; this figure reached the Senate, he assumes, partly through Alcaeus' epigram and perhaps via an Aetolian embassy. But there is no reason to assume the Romans incapable of exaggerating their victory or that Polybius' figure of 8,000 (xviii. 27. 6; cf. Livy, xxxiii. 10. 7; Plut. *Flam.* 8. 5) was necessarily that of Flamininus.

² *Op. cit.* iii. 338, n. 2. See Polyb. xxxii. 2. 4 f. The Alcaeus mentioned is probably the Messenian; cf. Knaack *ap. Susemihl*, *op. cit.* ii. 546,

n. 140. When the literary controversy between Isocrates and Alcaeus took place cannot be determined, for it is not known how old the former was when he was sent to Rome a prisoner in 162 B.C. (cf. Niese, *op. cit.* iii. 246); Dr. Treves makes the plausible suggestion that Isocrates was 'a peninsular Greek, who made himself unpopular in the last decade of Philip V, and therefore took refuge at the court of Syria'.

³ The MSS. give this poem twice, once after *Anth. Pal.* xi. 12; and in its original position it lacks lines 5-6. Hence J.-Ph. D'Orville's theory that there were two editions, only the second of which had the two last lines; this edition was subsequent to the murder of Callias and Epicles, and included the present reading of line 1, which hitherto read: *πίομαι, Ἐλλήνες, πολὺ πλεόν κτλ.* Ἐλλήνες is the reading of P¹, and is accepted by Reitzenstein, *Epigramm u. Skolion* (1893), 90, n. 3, who thinks that the appeal to the Greeks to rise against Philip 'scheint mir hier passend: die zweite Lesart ὦ Αἰναιεῖ matt'. But

The literary form represented by these two epigrams has been closely defined by Reitzenstein¹ as the *παίγνιον*—a short poem of a light nature, perhaps a mock epitaph on a Homeric hero or a famous poet,² or more particularly a poem on the subject of wine-bibbing, to be improvised or recited at the banquet. This explains in part the prominence given in both to the theme of drinking, and gives special point to the accusation that at just such a banquet Philip was wont to poison his guests.³ The poems are further alike in being based on phrases and situations taken from the *Odyssey*. The first (ix. 519) is a deliberate reminiscence of *Odyssey*, ix. 296 f.:

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Κύκλωψ μεγάλην ἐμπλήσατο νηδὺν
ἀνδρόμεα κρέ' ἔδων καὶ ἐπ' ἄκρητον γάλα πίνων κτλ.;

later this passage goes on to describe how Polyphemos, after making a meal of two of Odysseus' comrades, was lulled to sleep by drinking thrice of the heady wine the Ithacan offered him—

τρίς μὲν ἔδωκα φέρων, τρίς δ' ἔκπιεν ἀφραδίῃσιν (361)

and eventually blinded, so that his victims made good their escape. *Πίομαι πολὺ πλέον ἢ πῖε Κύκλωψ* therefore means that Alcaeus outdrinks even the Cyclops, his 'hardness' of drinking being not only in the traditional vein of this type of poem (which had the old Ionic elegy, the songs of Anacreon, and the Attic *skolion* among its forbears),⁴ but also an earnest of the vigour with which he expresses the accompanying wish. The wish itself, though reminiscent of the legend of Tydeus and Melanippus, is also suggested by the same passage of Homer, where the Cyclops specifically smashes the brains of his victims;⁵ it is also fit retaliation on Philip who 'tastes the blood of his friends' by poisoning them.⁶

The second of these epigrams opens with a verbal echo of *Odyssey*, xxi. 295–6, where Antinous warns off the disguised Odysseus from trying the bow by quoting the fate that befell the wine-bemused Centaur Eurytion, in the Halls of the Lapith Peirithous.⁷ The theme had previously been borrowed by Callimachus,⁸ in an address

this appeal to the Greeks to rise appears to exist only in Reitzenstein's imagination.—There is no reason to accept the suggestion of Knaack ap. Susemihl, op. cit. ii. 545, n. 136, that lines 5–6 are to be placed before lines 3–4.

¹ Op. cit. 87; cf. Körte, op. cit. 361.

² An example from Alcaeus is *Anth. Pal.* vii. 1 (on Homer buried on Ios).

³ This accusation was constantly made against Philip, often where we know it to be untrue. His other alleged victims included the two Arati (Polyb. viii. 12. 2–8; Plut. *Aral.* 52. 1; 54. 2–3; Pausan. ii. 9. 4), Chariteles of Cyparissia (Livy (Pol.), xxxii. 21. 23), Eurycleides and Micion of Athens (Pausan. ii. 9. 4; cf. Treves, *Les ét. class.* ix, 1940, 147–9), Cassander, the *epistates* of Maronea (Polyb. xxii. 14. 2–6), and Philip's own son Demetrius (full references in *Philip V*, 252); see *Philip V*, 124, n. 6, also for references to the alleged attempt to murder Philopoemen. That the tradition had a contemporary origin and some basis in fact is to be seen from Flamininus' taunt at the conference in Locris (Plut. *Flam.* 17. 2; *Moral.* 197 A; Polyb. xviii. 7. 6); it appears in its exaggerated form in Pausan. vii. 17. 15 and Diod. xxviii. 3 (Philip so uncontrolled ἐν ταῖς εὐτυχίαις, ὥστε τοὺς μὲν φίλους ἀκρίτως ἀποσφάζει!).

⁴ Cf. Athen. xi. 473 A for Hedylus' poem 'πίνωμεν κτλ.?' or *Anth. Pal.* xii. 50: πῖν' Ἀσκληπιάδῃ (also Hedylus).

⁵ *Od.* ix. 290: ἐκ δ' ἐγκέφαλος χαμάδις ῥέε, δεῦρε δὲ γαῖαν. Cf. Eur. *Cyc.* 402.

⁶ The idea is reminiscent of Theognis, 349: τῶν εἶη μέλαν αἷμα πινέω. His bitterness was likely to appeal to Alcaeus. The theme quickly grew into the tradition about Philip; cf. Polyb. vii. 13. 7: Philip like a werewolf καθάπερ ἂν ἐργενεσάμενος αἵματος ἀνθρωπιέου. Very relevant to this poem are the observations of K. Kircher, *Die sakrale Bedeutung des Weines im Altertum* (1910), 74 f., on the close connexion in primitive thought between blood and wine, and the custom among many peoples of drinking the blood of one's enemy (e.g. Thracians (Amm. Marcell. 27. 4); Scythians (Herod. iv. 65)). Kircher's work brings out the sacral origins of the symposium, which Philip's poisonings had outraged.

⁷ *Od.* xxi. 295–8:

οἶνος καὶ Κένταυρον, ἀγακλυτὸν Εὐρυτίωνα,
ἄσος' ἐνὶ μεγάρῳ μεγαθύμου Πειριθόου,
ἐς Λαπίθας ἐλθόνθ'· ὁ δ' ἐπεὶ φρένας ἄσεν οἶνω,
μαυόμενος κάκ' ἔρεξε δόμον κάτα Πειριθόου.

⁸ *Anth. Pal.* vii. 725; Virgil imitated it,

to a certain Menecrates of Aenus in Thrace, thought to have lost his life through drink; and the correspondence Menecrates-Epicrates, already noted by Chardon de la Rochette,¹ suggests that it was the name of Philip's victim which reminded Alcaeus of Callimachus' epigram and of a theme so appropriate to his own purpose. For in fact the point of both epigrams is that Philip is the Cyclops and the Centaur.² This is quite clear from the comparison between the two legends and their analogy to Philip's career. Both the Homeric passages on which Alcaeus has drawn describe how a barbarous and semi-human monster outraged the laws of hospitality (in one case as a guest, in the other as a host)³ by murder or violence; in both cases wine played an important role (in inspiring the Centaur's offence, and lulling the Cyclops into a fatal slumber); and both met the retribution appropriate to such monsters—mutilation and humiliation.⁴

Now this sequence of events (short of the ultimate and desiderated retribution) is exactly that which the hostile tradition attributes to Philip, who is therefore fittingly compared to a Centaur or a Cyclops;⁵ in the second poem he is specifically designated *ὁ μονόμματος*. But there was a further convenient reason why Philip should be nicknamed Cyclops or Centaur. We have already referred to Philip's pains to identify himself with the Argead dynasty, and in particular with Philip II,⁶ to whom he showed a marked temperamental resemblance;⁷ and the epigram *Anth. Pal.* ix. 518 showed him to be by no means indifferent to the exploits of his ancestor Demetrius Poliorcetes. Now by a strange coincidence both Philip II and Antigonos I were one-eyed, *ἐτερόφθαλμοι*; and both were, not unnaturally, connected with the Cyclops.⁸ Of Philip it is recorded, on the authority of Marsyas of Pella (or Philippi), that at a musical performance just before he lost his eye at Methone, quite by chance there was a performance of the *Cyclops*;⁹ and Aelian¹⁰ states that Antigonos I

Catalept. xi. 1-4 (and cf. *Georg.* ii. 455). *Οἶνος καὶ Κέρναιπον* also occurs in *Anth. Pal.* xi. 1, line 3 (by Nicarchus).

¹ S. Chardon de la Rochette, *Mélanges de critique et de philologie*, ii (1812), 295-8; he assumes both names to be invented, as being 'distingué par le courage et la force' and so suitable for men who were being compared with a Centaur. This seems to me somewhat far-fetched and moreover misses the real point of Alcaeus' epigram.

² For the Cyclops identification see Stadtmüller, ad loc.

³ Cf. for instance *Od.* ix. 370: τὸ δὲ τοι ξεινήιον ἔσται.

⁴ Cf. the legend of Apollo and Marsyas.

⁵ On Philip's alleged murders see above, p. 4, n. 3; on his licentiousness and heavy drinking, cf. Polyb. xxv. 3. 7 (contrast with Perseus); Polyb. x. 26; Livy (Pol.), xxvii. 31; xxxii. 21. 24; Plut. *Moral.* 760 A; *Aral.* 51. 2-3 (behaviour at Argos in 209, and rape of Polycrateia of Argos); Livy (Pol.), xxxvii. 7. 8-12 (Ti. Gracchus finds him drunk at Pella).

⁶ On this see Tarn, *JHS*, liii, 1933, 61; Edson, *Harv. Stud.* xlv, 1934, 216-17; Dow and Edson, *ibid.* xlvi, 1937, 159, n. 3; Aymard, *REA*, xxxix, 1937, 19, n. 7; *Premiers rapports*, 54, n. 30; Walbank, op. cit. 258, n. 3. The relevant texts are Polyb. v. 10. 10; Livy (Pol.), xxvii.

30. 9; xxxii. 22. 11; Pausan. vii. 7. 5; Photius, *Bibl.* 176, p. 121 a, 35 (= *Fr. gr. Hist.* 115 T. 31); *IG*² iv. 1, No. 590, line 5 (if one accepts Wilhelm's restoration, *Wien. Anz.* lviii, 1921, 73: αἰτεῖν Ἑλλάνων ἀγ[εμόν] Ἀργεάδαν); cf. also Plut. *Aem. Paull.* 12. 9 f; Zonaras, ix. 24 A, C; Propert. iv. 11. 39; Sil. Ital. *Punica*, xv. 291-2; *Anth. Pal.* vii. 238 (if the last couplet refers to Philip V and not Alexander the Great). Livy (Pol.), xlv. 7. 3, on the other hand, appears to draw a contrast between Philip II and Alexander and Perseus' ancestors *quos sanguine et genere contingebat*.

⁷ Demosthenes' famous description of Philip II's φιλοπραγμοσύνη (*Olynth.* i. 17; cf. G. Macurdy, *AJPh*, xlviii, 1927, 203; Treves, *Nuova riv. stor.* xxii, 1938, 13 f.) could be applied unchanged to Philip V.

⁸ I am glad to note that this link with Philip II was also observed by Momigliano, *JRS*, xxxii, 1942, 57, to whom I owe the reference to Didymus in the next note.

⁹ Whether of Euripides or Antiphanes (Kock, ii. 64, 131-3) is not stated. Didymus (ed. Diels-Schubart), 12. 55; cf. *Fr. gr. Hist.* 76 F. 36 (Doris); 135-6 F. 17 (Marsyas). See Treves, *Athen.* xiii, 1935, 51.

¹⁰ Ael. *V.H.* xii. 43; cf. Plut. *Quaest. conviv.* ii. 1. 9. 633 C; Lucian, *Macrob.* 11; Plut. *Sert.* i. 8-9 (mentioning Philip II too).

(μόνοφθαλμος) was also dubbed *Κύκλωψ* as a second nickname. Furthermore, the taunt that Philip V was a centaur also sends us back to Philip II; for Theopompus concluded a long passage of abuse of Philip II and his Companions with these words:¹ ἡγοῦμαι τοιαῦτα θηρία γεγονέναι καὶ τοιούτους τὸν τρόπον τοὺς φίλους καὶ τοὺς ἐταίρους Φιλίππου προσαγορευθέντας οἷους οὔτε τοὺς Κενταύρους τοὺς τὸ Πήλιον κατασχόντας οὔτε τοὺς Λαιστργόνας τοὺς τὸ Λεοντίνων πεδίων οἰκήσαντας οὔτε ἄλλους οὐδ' ὅποιους.² What better answer was there then to Philip's proud boasts about his ancestry than to retort: 'Yes, you are indeed your ancestors' true descendant; for they were Cyclopes and Centaurs and so are you—witness your conduct!' It was a taunt excellently designed to penetrate the armour of a king who prided himself on being the defender of Hellas against the barbarian.³ And there is reason to think it stuck.⁴

What then was the date of these two epigrams by Alcaeus, the subject-matter and treatment of which clearly links them together chronologically? Unfortunately neither Epicrates nor Callias has been satisfactorily identified. The old view that Callias was a tragic and Epicrates a comic poet⁵ seems to be quite arbitrary and improbable. More recently Callias has been tentatively identified with Philip's agent at Nisyros, or the Delian who proposed honours to the father of Philip's enemy,

¹ Quoted by Polyb. viii. 9. 13 (*Fr. gr. Hist.* 115 F. 225).

² The term 'Centaur' seems further to have carried overtones of obscene insult, perhaps not inappropriate to Philip's reputation as a philanderer: cf. Eustath., p. 528. 43; p. 1910. 10: ὅτι δὲ καὶ τὸ γυναικεῖον μόριον δηλοῖ ὁ Κένταυρος, δηλοῦσιν οἱ παλαιοὶ, φέροντες καὶ χρῆσιν Θεοπόμπου (i.e. the fourth-century comic poet, fr. 89) εἰς τοῦτο. μικρότερον δὲ τούτου εἰς σκῶμμα τὸ εἰρησθαι Κένταυρον, ὅς κενεῖ ὄρρον τὸν παρὰ τῷ κομικῷ. Photius (ed. Naber), p. 334, has also the first of Eustathius' definitions; and for the second cf. Hesych. (ed. Schmidt) 2200, 26: Κένταυροι· λησταί. καὶ οἱ Αἰνῆνες. καὶ οἱ παιδερασταί, ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρρου. (ὄρρος is here used as equivalent to the obscene sense of ταῦρος.)

³ This hypothesis is confirmed by Pausan. vii. 7. 5 (a passage of non-Polybian origin), which connects Philip's pride in Philip II with his poisoning triumphs; cf. Polyb. viii. 8. 4, which by implication contrasts the two Philips to the advantage of the son of Amyntas.

⁴ It may appear in Ennius. A fragment preserved by Priscian from the ninth book of the *Annales* is an almost direct translation of *Od.* ix. 296 f., used as a simile:

Cyclops venter velut olim turserat alte
carnibus humanis distentus.

(*Ann.* ix. 14 (v. 321) Vahlen = Diehl, *Poet. rom. vet.* 117 = Steuart, ix, fr. 12)

The contents of Book IX are uncertain: Vahlen (*Ennianae poesis reliquiae*² (1928), pp. cxc-cxcii) suggests that it dealt with the end of the Second Punic War, and Miss E. M. Steuart (*The Annals of Q. Ennius* (1925), 181) with the *aristeia* of Scipio. Certainly Book X introduces the Second War with Philip, apparently as a new topic (cf. Vahlen, x. 1 (v. 326) = Diehl, 118):

Insece, Musa, manu Romanorum induperator
quod quisque in bello gessit cum rege Philippo.

It would, however, be rash, even in view of Livy's virtual silence concerning Macedon between the Peace of Phoenice and the Second Macedonian War, to rule out the possibility that Book IX contained a transitional passage, dealing with the outrages committed by Philip, and containing this Homeric simile in such a context. (The comparison is specifically to 'Cyclops venter distentus'; but this may be no more than a poetical version of 'Cyclops venter distento', just as in Juvenal, iv. 107: 'Montani quoque venter adest abdomine tardus' the meaning is 'Montanus adest, homo ventriosus' as the words 'abdomine tardus' show.) This hypothesis is to some extent strengthened if one accepts the plausible suggestion of Professor Wade-Gery (ap. Momigliano, *JRS*, xxxii, 1942, 54, n. 5) that Ennius' famous epitaph on Scipio (Vahlen, *Varia*, 21ss = Diehl, 392) is a definite reply to *Anth. Pal.* xvi. 6 and to some extent ix. 518; here again Ennius would show himself influenced by contemporary Greek propagandist literature. In the present instance, Ennius' use of the simile would go to show that Alcaeus' taunt had passed into popular currency, in the same way as his epigram on Philip's defeat at Cynoscephalae. Ennius might have heard it at Rome from soldiers back from the Second Macedonian War, or even during his own visit to Ambracia with Q. Fulvius Nobilior in 189 (Cicero, *Tusc.* i. 2). It may thus have played an important part in helping to shape the anti-Macedonian version of Philip's career, which is of course the one that has survived.

⁵ So Dübner and Paton in the Didot and Loeb editions.

Philip
These
imagin
Rhode
were C
inspire
among
that d
purely
import
of pass
the sp
and or
the mu
may h

To
of all
carried
Nabis
Leagu
Epicra
reactio
of this
is that
during
forced
a nece
than t
and p
all his

It
the ex
and i

¹ Fo
(= Syl
corum
tentati
54, n.
Schoch
B. iv,
identifi
alterna
that of
4. 751
² Li
Aristac
crimes,
Cypari
deaths
and Ca
since 2

Philip of Megalopolis, and Epicrates with the famous Rhodian admiral of that name.¹ These identifications are possible, but not very likely: in particular, it is difficult to imagine how Philip could have come to be sitting at table along with Epicrates of Rhodes. What, I think, can be assumed with certainty is that Epicrates and Callias were Greeks; if they were Macedonians, it is unlikely that their death would have inspired Alcaeus' outburst. But in that case, Aristaenus' failure to mention them among Philip's victims, in his speech of 198,² suggests that they were still alive at that date. Now we may take it that Philip's assassinations (in so far as they were not purely the inventions of hostile propaganda) had usually a political basis; the political importance of most of his alleged victims goes to show that he did not murder out of passion or caprice. If then the deaths of Epicrates and Callias occurred between the speeches at Sicyon in October 198 and the battle of Cynoscephalae in June 197—and one may only suggest this tentatively, since it depends on the assumption that the murders were directly linked with the breach between Alcaeus and Philip—they may have been connected with Philip's compact with Nabis in the autumn of 198.³

To the Achaean *bourgeoisie* at least, this compact must have seemed the betrayal of all that Macedon had been summoned back to the Peloponnese to uphold, for it carried with it the surrender of Argos to the predatory, revolutionary imperialism of Nabis; it must have put the last strain on the loyalty of the large minority within the League who resisted even Aristaenus' powerful *argumentum ad utilitatem*. Whether Epicrates and Callias—Greeks at least, and, if we may judge from Alcaeus' strong reaction to their deaths, perhaps Peloponnesians or even Messenians—were victims of this final breach, can only be the subject of conjecture.⁴ The point I would stress is that, whatever the personal aspect of Alcaeus' breach with Philip, its occurrence during the years 200–197 corresponds closely to the social and political necessity which forced the *bourgeoisie* in Achaëa to change their allegiance from Macedon to Rome—a necessity which transcended questions of personal loyalty. What is more important than the elucidation of hypothetical personal grudges is to see how Alcaeus' social and political background brought him within that movement, and so made him, for all his fiery individualism, the voice of powerful elements within the Peloponnese.

V. ALCAEUS AND PELOPONNESIAN POLITICS

It is not unusual to see in Alcaeus the 'representative of a sterner patriotism',⁵ the exception in an age which treated the old city-state partisanship as out of date and irrelevant. This view presupposes that Alcaeus broke with Philip after the

¹ For Callias of Nisyros cf. *IG* xii. 3. 91 (= *Syll.*³ 572 = Schroeter, *De regum hellenisticorum epistulis* (1932), 80, No. 33); suggested tentatively by Momigliano, *JRS*, xxxii, 1942, 54, n. 9, and by Dr. Treves, privately (*contra*, Schoch, *P-W*, s.v. 'Kallias (14 a and b)', Suppl.-B. iv, col. 856); Dr. Treves also suggests the identification with the Delian Callias as an alternative (cf. *IG* xi. 4. 750 (= *Syll.*³ 576)), and that of Epicrates with the Rhodian (cf. *IG* xi. 4. 751 = *Syll.*³ 582; Livy (Pol.), xxxvii. 13. 11).

² Livy (Pol.), xxxii. 21; particularly § 21 f. Aristaenus is not giving a full catalogue of Philip's crimes, but since he mentions Chariteles of Cyparissia, the plundering of Messene, and the deaths of the Arati, it is likely that if Epicrates and Callias had been murdered within the period since 201 he would not have omitted them.

³ *Philip V*, 163 f.

⁴ Dr. Treves has suggested to me privately that the adjective *ἐραπελοιο* in line 5 of *Anth. Pal.* ix. 519 has a technical sense, and that Epicrates and Callias were Greeks whom Philip had enrolled among his *ἐταῖροι* or *φίλοι*. If that is so, their murder may be hinted at in Flamininus' taunt at the Locrian conference (see above, p. 4, n. 3) that Philip had murdered the most reliable of his *φίλοι*; in that case, of course, their deaths preceded the compact with Nabis, and their breach with Philip may reflect a Greek reaction to the new Roman *προαίρεσις*, first clearly formulated at Antigoneia in spring 198 (*Philip V*, 151–2). But was *ἐταῖρος* ever used in the technical sense at Philip V's court?

⁵ E. A. Barber, *CAH*, vii. 269.

Messenian troubles of 215–214, and it falls once that assumption is shown to be groundless. The fact that Alcaeus could remain an enthusiastic supporter of Macedon even after those troubles is indeed evidence for a positive political outlook of a wider kind;¹ and a clue to this emerges from a comparison between two of the epigrams already considered—that on the Colossus of Rhodes (*Anth. Pal.* vi. 171) and Alcaeus' poem contrasting Flamininus and Xerxes (*Anth. Pal.* xvi. 5).

In the first of these the Rhodian claim to rule by land and sea is linked up with a further idea—that Rhodes has established *ἐλευθερία* in both these spheres (lines 5–6).² Now it is clear that when the Romans took over the first concept they took over the second as well.³ Momigliano has discussed the idea of lordship by land and sea in the *Alexandra* of Lycophron and has traced the shape the formula later assumes under the empire.⁴ The cognate idea of *ἐλευθερία* is to be seen in Flamininus' proclamation at the Isthmus in 196 (which followed the lines of the senatorial resolution)⁵ and particularly in the first epigram quoted in Plutarch's *Life of Flamininus*, 12. 6, in which Flamininus, the descendant of Aeneas, is lauded for his gift of freedom (lines 3–4):

Αἰνεάδας Τίτος ὅμμιν ὑπέρτατον ὤπασε δῶρον,
Ἑλλήνων τεύξας πασὶν ἐλευθερίαν.⁶

It also appears as Alcaeus' justification of Flamininus' invasion of Greece, when contrasted with that of Xerxes.⁷

Now it is clear that a specifically Peloponnesian line of propaganda had seen Doson and Philip V as continuing the fourth-century policy of Philip II, and acting as the defenders of the Peloponnese against Sparta. In the earlier period this Philo-Macedonism had been the natural policy of the newly liberated Peloponnesian states—Messenia and Arcadia; in the later it was the policy of the Achaean *bourgeoisie*,

¹ It may also be accounted evidence for the view that Polybius gives a biased and exaggerated version of Philip's part in the troubles; that there were writers who justified or even exonerated Philip is clear from Polybius' censure (viii. 8. 4), and his contrast of these latter-day pro-Macedonians with the 'praiseworthy' *Μακεδονίζοντες* of the time of Philip II, so unjustly attacked by Demosthenes! Polybius' change in what he considers a proper policy towards Macedon appears to reflect his moral judgement on Philip II and Philip V: in reality it reflects the political interests of the Peloponnese and specifically those of the Megalopolitan *bourgeoisie*.

² On the special connexion between Helios and Liberty see the references in Momigliano, *JRS*, xxxii, 1942, 55, n. 13.

³ The Roman *prociptus* at this time is excellently discussed and illustrated by M. Gelzer, *Hermes*, lxxviii, 1933, 132–3, 145.

⁴ *JRS*, xxxii, 1942, 57–64.

⁵ See *Philip V*, 179, n. 1, 181, n. 2 for references.

⁶ Bergk, *Poet. lyr. graec.* iii. 196, claims this poem for Alcaeus (following Hecker). The data are not adequate for a decision one way or the other. The connecting of Rome with Troy, implied in *Αἰνεάδας*, is typical of the Roman propaganda of this time; cf. *Syll.* 591 (in which the theme recurs in an appeal of Lampsacus to be

included in the peace after Cynoscephalae; see Bickermann, *Philol.* lxxxvii, 1932, 277–99) and Lycophron, 1226 f., 1442 f. (if Ziegler is right in dating its composition c. 196).

⁷ Particularly interesting and significant is Livy (Pol.), xxxiv. 32. 13 (Flamininus' reply to Nabis): 'hoc tu dicas *liberantibus Graeciam*? hoc iis qui, ut *liberare* possent, mare traiecerunt, *terra marique* gesserunt bellum?' Here in a specifically anti-Spartan context Flamininus combines the two clauses of Roman propaganda—*ἐλευθερία* and successful action by land and sea—in an obvious appeal to Peloponnesian sentiment. In return the Greeks acclaimed Flamininus by the title he had thus chosen: cf. Livy (Pol.), xxxiv. 50. 9 (at Corinth in 194): 'prosequentibus cunctis, servatorem liberatoremque exclamantibus'—the cue having been given in Flamininus' speech (Livy (Pol.), xxxiv. 49); see the other passages quoted in *CQ.* xxxvi. p. 145, n. 1, and in addition *Syll.* 613, n. 11. 1058, for the Eleutheria games set up by Flamininus at Larisa, in imitation of those still celebrated at Plataea (a reference which I owe to Dr. Ehrenberg). This same *libertas* motif is once more resuscitated (after a gap of some years; cf. G. Colin, *Rome et la Grèce* (1905), 420) in 170, at the time of the war with Perseus (cf. Livy (Ann.), xliii. 8. 6 f.: the Senate's reply to the complaints of Chalcis against C. Lucretius; (Ann.) xlv, 18; Polyb. xxxvii. 17. 13).

represented by Aratus, who called in Antigonos Doson against the 'socialist imperialism' of Cleomenes. Polybius, a Megalopolitan and an Achaean, is at pains to assert the logical continuity of the policy, in his defence both of Aratus and of the Peloponnesian 'patriots' of the fourth century, who ἐποίησαν ἀναπνεῦσαι καὶ λαβεῖν ἐλευθερίας ἔννοιαν πάντας τοὺς τὴν Πελοπόννησον κατοικοῦντας (xviii. 14. 6).¹ Particularly during the Social War, there was great bitterness against Sparta, to which Aetolia was now added as a further enemy. This feeling is to be seen in the inscription of Epidauros in honour of Philip dating from this period;² and it is paralleled by the rest of the adulation of Philip V, in whom the Achaeans saw their 'darling of Greece', the leader of the Hellenic Symmarchy.³

As Treves has pointed out,⁴ the late third and early second centuries saw a revival of the slogans and attitudes of the fourth century, and their adaptation to current events, particularly in those towns of the Peloponnese where the traditions of the 'liberation' were still strong. Here, in the once Spartan states, such a combined allegiance as that of the Acarnanian Damagetus would have been an impossibility.⁵ In the midst of the Social War Damagetus could compose epigrams in which a strong patriotic feeling for Achaea and Acarnania is combined with an enthusiasm for Tyrtæan Sparta. To an Acarnanian not Sparta but Aetolia was the arch-enemy. The Isthmus marked an ideological as well as a geographical boundary.⁶ But in the towns of Achaea liberty was conceived in anti-Spartan terms⁷—as when Philopoemen, fresh from his victory over Machanidas, was greeted on his arrival in the theatre at the Nemean Games by the minstrel Pylades singing the opening lines from Timotheus' *Persae*:

Κλεινὸν ἐλευθερίας τεύχων μέγαν Ἑλλάδι κόσμον.⁸

It was a sentiment that Philip V knew how to exploit, with his constant stress on the identity of name and purpose between himself and his great predecessor.⁹

¹ That he is not very happy in this *apologia* can be seen from the surprising contradiction which emerges from the comparison of xviii. 14. 6 with xviii. 11. 4 and 6; the phrases ἔννοιαν λαβεῖν ἐλευθερίας and ἀναπνεῦσαι occur in both passages, but whereas in one they describe a policy which involved the Macedonian occupation of Corinth and several Peloponnesian towns, in the other they refer specifically to the evacuation of Corinth by Philip V's garrisons! For recent discussion of this very illuminating piece of Polybian polemic against Demosthenes see E. Drerup, *Demosthenes im Urteile des Allertums* (1923), 123–5; A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *Demosthenes and the Last Days of Greek Freedom* (1914), 489 f.; A. Aymard, *Rev. Hist.* lxiii. 183, 1938, 79 f.; *ibid.* lxiv. 185, 1939, 216–18; P. Cloché, *ibid.*, and *Ant. class.* viii, 1939, 361 f.; cf. Treves, *Les ét. class.* ix, 1940, 168, n. 2.

² *IG* iv. 2. 1. 590; cf. Hiller v. Gaertringen, *Hist. gr. Epig.* 103. This epigram is an interesting counterpart to Polybius' defence of the fourth-century Macedonizers, in its praise of Philip V who (lines 6–7: νόσω | Ἀπίδι (i.e. the Peloponnese) τὰν ὁλοὴν ἀρκεσε δουλοσύναν), | πολλὰ μὲν Αἰτωλοῖσι κ[ακορρέκταις κακὰ β]έξας, | μυρία δ' εὐπώλωι λυγρὰ [Λακωνίδι γὰρ].

³ Polyb. vii. 11. 8.

⁴ *Les. ét. class.* ix, 1940, 167–8.

⁵ On Damagetus see P. Friedländer, *AJPh*, lxiii, 1942, 78–82. Wilamowitz, *Hell. Dichtung*, i. 223, describes Damagetus as 'obviously a Peloponnesian'; R. Reitzenstein, *P-W*, s.v. 'Damagetos (4)', col. 2027, recognizes the Peloponnesian tradition in his work, but locates him in one of the Dorian districts linked with the Achaean League. From Friedländer's article it seems clear that he was an Acarnanian, probably from near Thyrrheum.

⁶ On this see Treves, *op. cit.* 160–1; the clash came almost to the surface in the debate which attended the opening of Philip's naval policy in spring, 218; cf. *Philip V*, 53 f. (rival policies urged by Acarnania and the Peloponnesian states of the Symmarchy).

⁷ Two anti-Spartan epigrams (celebrating the destruction of 188) are *Anth. Pal.* vii. 723 (anon.) and *P. Ox.* (ed. Grenfell and Hunt), iv, No. 662 (Amyntas); cf. Powell, *New Chapters in Greek Literature* (Series 3), 1935, 188–9.

⁸ *Plut. Philop.* 11. 2.

⁹ See above, p. 5, n. 6. It is perhaps not fanciful to see in the epigram on Titus and Xerxes (*Anth. Pal.* xvi. 5) a reply to the Macedonian propaganda. Philip II and Alexander built up Hellenic unity around the anti-Persian campaign, which was presented as just retribution for Marathon and the Persian invasion of

In this situation a clue to Alcaeus' allegiance is to be found in his literary antecedents. Knaack¹ has pointed out two elements in which Alcaeus' epigrams show the influence of the satiric verse of Cercidas of Megalopolis—in his adoption of the Cynic trick of employing unusual compounds² (his οἰνοχάρων (*Anth. Pal.* xi. 12, line 3) being an echo of Cercidas' λεβητοχάρων),³ and in their common enthusiasm for Homer.⁴ In addition, one may add, Alcaeus seems to have shared the Cynic love of parody.⁵ His Homeric reminiscences, already discussed, are a case in point. But in addition Porphyry records⁶ how Alcaeus, ὁ τῶν λουιδόρων ἰάμβων καὶ ἐπιγραμμάτων ποιητὴς παρώδηκε τὰς Ἐφόρου κλοπὰς ἐξελέγχων; and the *Syncriseis*, 'critical comparisons',

Xerxes. As the true descendant of Philip II, Philip V may have attempted to represent the Romans as a second Persian invader, against whom he would rally Greece. Alcaeus retaliates by elaborating the comparison—the difference being that Flamininus comes to free Greece. The conceit is in keeping with the age that produced the *Alexandra*; and a similar point is made by Polybius, in relation to Perseus of Macedon, when after his preliminary cavalry victory, popular opinion in Greece veered round to his side (xxvii. 9). Polybius tells how the famous Cleitomachus of Thebes was fighting an Egyptian champion and, when the crowd cheered his opponent, reproved them, by pointing out that he was fighting ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων δόξης. The point the historian would make is that the Romans were now fighting 'for the glory of the Greeks', and Perseus, the king of Macedon, was now the outsider. The wheel had swung full circle.

¹ ap. Susemihl, op. cit. ii. 546, n. 140.

² Cf. Gerhard, *P-W*, s.v. 'Kerkidas (2)', cols. 302–3, who quotes Schmidt, *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1912, 639 f. for a list of these. Cercidas' διπλά and τριπλά are also discussed by Pasquali, *Orazio lirico* (1920), 220 f.

³ Cf. J. U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina* (1925), 212, fr. 11 (= Athen. viii. 347 E).

⁴ To the examples from Alcaeus quoted above one may add *Anth. Pal.* ix. 518, where ἀμπατά links Philip's attempt on Olympus with the attempt of Otus and Ephialtes (*Od.* xi. 316) to pile Ossa on Olympus and Pelion on Ossa, ὡς οὐρανὸς ἀμπατὸς εἴη (see also *CQ.* xxxvi, p. 136, n. 3). *Anth. Pal.* vii. 1 and vii. 5 (by Alcaeus?) are not important for this point. The fragments of Cercidas constantly refer to Homer, and according to one tradition he left instructions that *Iliad* i and ii were to be buried with him (Ptolem. τὸν Ἡφαιστίου ap. Photius, *Bibl.* 190; cf. Eust. B, p. 199; Aelian, *V.H.* xiii. 20).

⁵ Von Arnim, *P-W*, s.v. 'Bion', col. 485. Bion used 'die in der kynischen oder kynisch beeinflussten Litteratur so beliebte Parodierung bekannter Dichterstellen'. Gerhard, loc. cit., speaks of Cercidas' use of compounds being reminiscent of the dithyramb, old comedy, and 'die bekanntlich selber vielfach von dieser ab-

hängigen, dem Kerkidas verwandten und gleichzeitigen Parodisten wie Bion'. Cf. Tarn, *Hellen. Civilisation*² (1930), 226.

⁶ Porphyry ap. Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* x. 3. 23. 467 d = *Fr. gr. Hist.* 70 T. 17. In the same passage Porphyry attributes two books *Περὶ τῆς Ἐφόρου κλοπῆς* to Lysimachus, probably the grammarian of that name and a contemporary of Alcaeus (cf. Gudeman, *P-W*, s.v. 'Lysimachos (20)', cols. 33–4; Jacoby, *Fr. gr. Hist.* ii c, commenting on 70 T. 17). Exposing plagiarism was apparently popular at this time. Another contemporary, famous in this as in so many other fields (cf. Vitruv. vii, praef. 5), Aristophanes of Byzantium, set the ball rolling with an 'exposure' of Menander entitled *Παράλληλοι Μενάνδρου τε καὶ ἀφ' ὧν ἔκλεψεν ἐκλογαί* (Porphyry ap. Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* x. 3. 12. 465 d). Gudeman suggests, very plausibly, that Lysimachus' work provided Alcaeus with his material; his contribution was the use of parody. The reason for Alcaeus' attack, which on this hypothesis was not simply a literary exposure, must remain obscure, so long as the question of Ephorus' attitude towards the fourth-century Macedonian hegemony remains under dispute; and this in turn depends on what view one takes of Diodorus' sources in Book XVI—a question which cannot be dealt with here. If one accepts Treves' theory (*Annali della R. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, S. II, vi, 1937, 255–79) that Ephorus' exaltation of Thebes is his way of expressing his panhellenic opposition to Macedon and the claims of Alexander, Alcaeus' attack may represent the third-century contrary propaganda of the Peloponnese, which claimed to see in Philip II the liberator of Greece from Sparta (see above, p. 8). But it is more usual to attribute the pro-Philippic passages of Diod. xvi, and in particular the prologue, to Ephorus (e.g. Momigliano, *Rend. Lomb.* lxx, 1932, 523–43; *Filippo*, 195; *Riv. Fil.* 180–204; N. G. L. Hammond, *Class. Quart.* xxxi, 1937, 88–9), in which case it would seem that Ephorus accepted the *fait accompli* of Chaeronea, like the anonymous author of the third letter of 'Isocrates'. In this case, Alcaeus' attempt to discredit Ephorus must be subsequent to his breach with Philip. This hypothesis has its difficulties, of which two

in which he attacked the rhetorician Isocrates,¹ must have been something of the same kind. It may be observed that this addition to parody on the part of Alcaeus lends a special point, not hitherto remarked, to Philip's reply by parody to the epigram on Cynoscephalae.²

If, however, Alcaeus followed Cercidas' literary style³ it is also possible that he was influenced by his politics; and Cercidas was a political figure of some importance in the latter part of the third century.⁴ When, in 227/6 B.C., the Achaean statesman, Aratus, felt obliged to seek the help of Antigonos Doson against the advance of Cleomenes, it was to Cercidas and a fellow-citizen from Megalopolis that he turned, as being both family friends of his own and *πρὸς τὴν ἐπιβολὴν εὐφρεῖς* (Polyb. ii. 48. 4)—which probably means that they were pro-Macedonian, like their fellow-countrymen in general; for the Megalopolitans, says Polybius (ii. 48. 2) *οἰκίαις διακειμένους πρὸς τὴν Μακεδόνων οἰκίαν ἐκ τῶν κατὰ τὸν Ἀμύντου Φίλιππον εὐεργεσιῶν*. There is, however, still more specific evidence for the Macedonian sympathies of Cercidas. There was in the fourth century an Arcadian politician of this name whom Demosthenes (*De Corona*, xviii. 295) attacked for being what would to-day be termed a Macedonian quisling,⁵ and whom Polybius, writing from the Arcadian standpoint in defence of his fellow-countryman, seeks to justify (xviii. 14). Hiller von Gaertringen has shown that both these men, and two others as well, belonged to the one Arcadian family, whose home was at Methydrium near Megalopolis.⁶ Thus their philo-Macedonism was hereditary, and Aratus' action in approaching Cercidas as his messenger to Doson is fully explained.

A second characteristic of Cercidas, likely to commend him to Aratus, was that he fully shared in the anti-Spartan policy of his city. In one of his poems⁷ he attacks Sphaerus, the Stoic adviser of Cleomenes, and he commanded 1,000 Megalopolitan troops armed in the Macedonian manner at Sellasia in 222 (Polyb. ii. 65. 3). Finally, he is generally believed to have urged a measure of voluntary social reform within the Peloponnese, in order to draw the teeth of Cleomenes' revolutionary propaganda. In the remarkable fourth fragment⁸ he urges the rich to establish voluntarily a system

may be noticed here. First, as the example of Polybius shows (see above, p. 8, n. 1), hostility towards Philip V did not necessarily involve an adjustment in one's attitude towards Philip II; and secondly, it is not easy to see why Alcaeus should have singled out Ephorus for attack in preference to Theopompus or one of the other writers of Philippic histories.

¹ See above, p. 3, n. 2.

² *Anth. Pal.* xvi. 26 B; cf. Plut. *Flam.* 9. 3; the coarser retort, *Anth. Pal.* ix. 520, is a good example of a *παίγνιον*, a mock epitaph composed over the wine-cups.

³ This literary affiliation is denied by Ad. Gerhard, *P-W*, s.v. 'Kerkidas (2)', col. 307; *Phoinix von Kolophon* (1909), 226, n. 6; but he hardly deals with Knaack's point. Incidentally, this affiliation to the Cynics shows conclusively that the Alcaeus (or Alcuius) expelled from Rome as an Epicurean philosopher (Athen. xii. 547 a; Aelian, *V.H.* ix. 12) has nothing to do with Alcaeus of Messene.

⁴ On Cercidas see Gerhard, *P-W*, s.v. 'Kerkidas (2)', cols. 294-308 (with the additional note of W. Kroll, col. 308); Wilamowitz, *Berlin Sitz.*

Ber., 1918, 1138 f.; J. U. Powell, *Coll. Alexand.* 201 f. for fragments; G. Pasquali, *Orazio lirico*, 210 f., 220, 226 f.; D. R. Dudley, *History of Cynicism* (1937), 74-84; E. A. Barber in Powell-Barber, *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature* (1921), 2 f. The identity of the poet, law-giver, and third-century politician is now generally accepted.

⁵ This Cercidas was also mentioned as a friend of Macedon by Theopompus in *Philipp.* 15, according to Harpokration, s.v. (cf. *Fr. gr. Hist.* 115 F. 119). Cf. also Demosth. *de fals. leg.* 256 f.

⁶ *IG v.* 2, p. 130, line 104, and p. 157; cf. Kroll, *P-W*, s.v. 'Kerkidas (2)', col. 308; Dudley, op. cit. 77.

⁷ Powell, op. cit. 210-11, fr. 8, line 9. On Sphaerus see Hobein, *P-W*, s.v. 'Sphairios (3)', cols. 1683-93; F. Ollier, *REG*, xlix, 1936, 537 f.

⁸ Powell, op. cit. 203-6, fr. 4. For the view that it is directed against Cleomenes see Tarn, *Hellen. Civilisation*,² 226. D. R. Dudley, op. cit. 78-81, has recently suggested that this fragment is to be connected with the difficulties that arose in Megalopolis on its rebuilding after the destruction by Cleomenes. Prytanis, the Peripatetic,

of sharing out their wealth, healing the sick, and giving alms to the poor, lest worse befall them.¹ It is perhaps the clearest statement of the dilemma in which the Peloponnesian *bourgeoisie* found themselves, with an enemy at the gates who could make an overwhelming appeal to the depressed elements within; and for all that Cercidas speaks as one of the poor, in order to put the case more clearly, he is essentially the spokesman—the admonitory spokesman—of the class which found its salvation from Spartan imperialism and social revolution in the Hellenic Symmachy.²

It was to this strand of political thought, I suggest, that Alcaeus belonged. A friend of Macedon, a 'good Peloponnesian' (which meant a follower of Aratus and, later, Philopoemen), a member of the *bourgeoisie*, and above all anti-Spartan—these were attitudes as easy for a Messenian as for a Megalopolitan; and it is not perhaps irrelevant to remember that when Cleomenes took and destroyed Megalopolis in 223, it was in Messene that most of the inhabitants (including Cercidas, since he appeared next year at Sellasia) found a refuge.³ That there was personal contact between the two men on that occasion is at least possible; it would be but one aspect of the general movement of Messenia towards Achaea about this time.⁴ But in the case of Alcaeus these affiliations can also be illustrated from two epigrams of a private nature.

In *Anth. Pal.* vii. 412 Alcaeus laments the death of Pylades, the minstrel whose song greeted the entry of Philopoemen into the theatre at the Nemean Games of 205, after his victory at Mantinea.⁵ According to Plutarch the incident was a coincidence, since the minstrels were contesting for the prize; but without assuming in the face of Plutarch that the coincidence was actually engineered, one can well imagine how Pylades, by his manner of delivery and gestures, gave his audience their cue. The story certainly suggests that he shared the enthusiasm he helped to inspire; and that Alcaeus could write a tribute to him on his death would at least be curious, if Alcaeus were a loyal Messenian and nothing more—for at this time Messenia had been in the opposite camp to Achaea for some ten years. Again, in *Anth. Pal.* ix. 588, Alcaeus has a poem in honour of Cleitomachus of Thebes. Now apart from the fact that Boeotia was a loyal member of the Symmachy until 198–197, it is noteworthy that Cleitomachus is quoted with special approval by Polybius, in the anecdote already

who had been set up as *νομοθέτης*, was under Macedonian influence and therefore hampered. Cercidas, as Aratus' nominee, spoke out for the poor, and as a preliminary to becoming *νομοθέτης* himself wrote a poem which 'is not a warning to the governing classes to mend their ways while there is yet time, but a call to the party of reform not to wait for the vengeance of Heaven to strike the rich, but to act themselves under the inspiration of a new triad of deities, Paean and Sharing (*Μεράδως*) and Nemesis'. I do not find this very convincing. First, it presupposes that when Cercidas speaks as a poor man, he is speaking *in person* and not merely putting a case. But (as has been pointed out by E. A. Barber in Powell-Barber, *New Chapters* (1921), 3, who also believes Cercidas to be speaking *in persona*) it seems unlikely that the *πατρικός ξένος* of Aratus and the Antigonids was among the downtrodden. Further, it implies that Aratus supported as *νομοθέτης* a man who preached revolutionary action and the sharing out of the land of the rich by the poor—which was precisely Cleomenes' programme, to thwart

which Aratus had recalled the Macedonians into the Peloponnese. Polybius' account of the settlement of 217 at Megalopolis (v. 93) is very vague, but it certainly suggests a compromise. (For a not very convincing hypothesis of how this was brought about see A. Ferrabino, *Arato di Sicione e l'idea federale* (1921), 218–21.)

¹ Fr. 4, lines 47–8:

ἄμυν δὲ Παιῶν καὶ Μεράδως μελέτω,
θεὸς γὰρ αὐτὰ, καὶ Νέμεσις κατὰ γῆν.

'Paean' may be, however, not the god of healing, but 'he who presides over the frugal banquets of the Cynics' (Pasquali, op. cit. 217).

² See *Philip V*, 17, 29–30, on the class alignment inside the Peloponnese and the role of the Symmachy in relation to it.

³ Polyb. ii. 61. 4; 62. 10; Plut. *Cleom.* 24. 1; *Philop.* 5. 1 f.; Pausan. iv. 29. 7–8. Cf. J. V. A. Fine, *AJPh*, lxi, 1940, 155.

⁴ This movement is described by Fine, op. cit. 155 f.

⁵ See above, p. 1, n. 6 and p. 9, n. 8.

referred to,¹ as fighting *ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων δόξης*. Again we may not press the evidence too far; but the story at least links Cleitomachus with Polybius and the Achaean camp. For Alcaeus it justifies the same kind of conclusions as might legitimately be drawn about a Frenchman who should (in 1942) write an epigram in honour of Max Schmeling.

In short, these two epigrams confirm the picture given by the rest of the evidence, that Alcaeus was a Messenian supporter of those Peloponnesian ideals which are to be discerned in the great figures of the Achaean League—in Aratus, Philopoemen, and Polybius. Like them he was ready to support Macedon so long as that power could unite Greece (specifically the Peloponnese), giving it freedom and independence in the face of the successive aggressions of Sparta, Aetolia, and Rome. It was a test which Philip fulfilled until 200: after that he failed his Greek allies; and in Aristaeus' harangue to the assembly of the Achaean League the need for a breach with Macedon is convincingly shown.² The reluctance with which the Achaeans took this inevitable step is apparent from the dissident action of Megalopolis, Dyme, and certain of the delegates from Argos; it appears even more clearly in the resistance which the people of Corinth offered, in company with the Macedonian garrison, and under a Macedonian general, to the forces of the League.³ In fact, it meant that the League broke with Macedon, without joining up enthusiastically with Rome.

This, I suggest, represented the course of political allegiance for Alcaeus too, a course quite distinct from and opposed to the particularism of Messene, which had been anti-Macedonian from 215 onwards, and in alliance with Rome since 211.⁴ For him, as for the Achaeans, the breach with Macedon must come sooner or later, once Philip could no longer afford the security which the Symmarchy was set up to achieve. Whether the political factor or the personal blow at the deaths of Epicrates and Callias was decisive, or whether indeed the murders were political and the two motives inextricably entwined, we can no longer say. But as in the case of the League, the immediate result was a period of negative and bitter hostility towards Macedon, devoid of any positive aspect or ideal; as a man with strong feelings and a sharp tongue, Alcaeus gave this hostility full rein in the 'Cyclops' and 'Centaur' epigrams and the first draft of the poem after Cynoscephalae.

But in 196 and 195 Flamininus made two proclamations which changed the whole political scene. In his announcement at the Isthmian games he decreed freedom to the states of Greece, following it up with the call to a crusade against the revolutionary imperialism of Cleomenes' successor, King Nabis of Sparta. Guarantor of freedom, friend of the *bourgeoisie*, foe to Sparta, Rome is henceforth all that Macedon had claimed to be; whereas Philip, before his final defeat, had proclaimed his ideological apostasy with the unforgivable and impolitic pact with Nabis. Like thousands of other 'good Peloponnesians', Alcaeus greeted the new era with enthusiasm. In an epigram he hailed the modern Xerxes, come to Greece not to enslave, but bringing the *ἄδρὸν ἀδουλῶτος φέγγος ἐλευθερίας*. Whether he lived to experience a second disillusionment we shall probably never know.

F. W. WALBANK

THE UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL.

¹ See above, p. 9, n. 9.

² Polyb. xviii. 13. 8; see the analysis in Aymard, *Premiers rapports*, 92 f. It is indeed true that the breach had been prepared. The Achaean *risorgimento* under Philopoemen had its anti-Macedonian aspect (cf. *Philip V*, 124, n. 6; Aymard, *Premiers rapports*, 47 n.); but as between Rome and Macedon, Philopoemen sought neutrality. And meanwhile Nabis' attack on Messene in 201, which represented a new Spartan claim to hegemony (cf. Aymard, *op. cit.* 41), served to recall the old basis of the

Achaeo-Macedonian rapprochement.

³ Livy (Pol.), xxxii. 22. 10-11 (Argos, Dyme, and Megalopolis); 23. 5 (Corinth).

⁴ *Philip V*, 78, n. 8; 301 f. It might be argued that Alcaeus' loyalty to Philip even after the Messenian troubles can be explained by assuming that he was at that time too young to be influenced by them; but the example of Ireland is sufficient evidence that the memory of such events dies hard. Alcaeus' allegiance can only be satisfactorily explained in political terms.

AN EARLY SOURCE OF POLIS-CONSTITUTION

AN archaic boustrophedon (or partly boustrophedon) inscription found a few years ago at Dreros is one of the oldest extant Cretan inscriptions, probably not later than 600 B.C., and is of the greatest interest for our knowledge of the early development of the Polis.¹ The text runs as follows:

1 ← *Αδ' εφάδε πολί' επει κα κοσμησει, δεκα ρετιον τον α-*

1α←θιοσολοιον

2 → *ρτον μη κοσμεν' αι δε κοσμησιε, οπε δικακσιε, αρτον οπηλεν διπλει κα ρτον*

3 ← *ακρηστον ημεν, ας δοοι, κοτι κοσμησιε, μηδεν ημην.*

4 ← *Ομοται δε κοσμος κοι δαμιοι κοι ικατι οι τας πολ[ιο]ς.*

Translation: 'This has pleased the Polis. When a man has been kosmos, the same man shall not be kosmos again within ten years. *θιοσολοιον* (?)—Should he be kosmos again, he shall himself be liable to fines double the amount of those inflicted by him as a judge; and he shall himself be unemployable² as long as he lives; and his acts as kosmos shall be null and void.

The oath shall be taken by the kosmos and the damioi and the Twenty of the Polis.'

The inscription is a public decree containing an important public law. The prescript *αδ' εφάδε πολί'*, 'this has pleased the Polis' is analogous to, but not identical with, that of later documents. In view of the oldest analogous records, the editors are right in saying that *πολί'* is the same as *τοῖς Δρηρίοις*, and that it means the assembly of the citizens (or rather, the constitutional representative of the State, whether that be the assembly or something else). I think there is no doubt about that; what needs further consideration is that the actual name of the people is not used. In SGDI 4982 (about 500 B.C. or even later) we read: *εφάδε τοῖς Γορτυνίοις*, in ICret. x. 2, 2 (about the same time): . . . *τοῖς Ἐλτυνίοις*. Our inscription is the only Cretan one of early times which uses the term *πόλις*. I regret that I did not know this inscription when I wrote my paper about the rise of the Polis.³ I then had no other epigraphic testimony proving the early use of the term, except a Cyzicene, i.e. an Ionian inscription (Syll.³ 4). It is important to know that Dorian states, even such a small Polis in archaic and remote Crete, likewise used the term *πόλις* instead of the individual name. This could not possibly happen without a rational consciousness of the Polis as a distinct and complete community, a consciousness which we did not expect in Dorian Crete. We see—and we shall see it even more clearly in discussing the rest of our document—that here the State must have long been taken for granted and is already highly organized.

One word more about the prescript. Later Cretan inscriptions usually have *ἔδοξε τοῖς κόσμοις καὶ τῇ πόλει*. This is in almost complete conformity with the development in Athens, where the older form was *ἔδοξεν τῷ δήμῳ*, the later one *ἔδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ*. This development seems contrary to the general constitutional development; the tendency was, if anything, democratic, i.e. a growing importance of the *δῆμος*, not of other elements. So far as I know, no attempt has been made to explain these facts. Swoboda,⁴ whose early book is still authoritative, states (but does not explain) the facts by calling the shorter formula 'a sign of the oldest style of records'. We cannot possibly assume that the older form implies that the council or (as in our case) the highest officials were of less importance in early times than

¹ Published by P. Demarque and H. van Effenterre, *Bull. Corr. Hell.*, 1937, 333 ff.

² We shall have to deal with the meaning of

this word *ακρηστος* later.

³ *Journ. Hell. Stud.* lvii (1937), 147 ff.

⁴ *Griechische Volksbeschlüsse*, 25.

later. The prescripts of the early type may, however, mean just the opposite, namely that council or officials acted for the people or the State—in its name as well as on its behalf—originally perhaps even without being compelled to consult the assembly. When later the decision of the people, or rather the collaboration of the older ruling bodies with the assembly, was the predominant feature, it became necessary to stress this fact by enumerating both parties. Dreros, of course, in the seventh and sixth century, was not a democracy at all, but some sort of aristocracy.

Before we deal with the various regulations of the decree we must say a few words on the enigmatic word *θιοσολοιον*, put in between the first and the second line of the inscription. The editors explained: *θεοσ-ολοιον*, 'condemned by the god', and connected the word with the next sentence, where *ακρηστον* would mean 'punished by human judgement'. But we shall see that this second interpretation is not to the point, and therefore there can be no contrast between divine and human punishment. Moreover, Signorina Garducci¹ made it quite clear, in my opinion, that the word, which was written in the same direction as the first line, was also written before the second line was inscribed. This is obvious when we look at the copy of the stone. Now, Cretan decrees usually begin with *θιοι*, and Signorina Garducci believes that *θιοσολοιος* (with a sigma, for *M[σ]* and *N[ν]* are very similar indeed in this writing) is *θεός ὁ λώιος*, meaning the same as *θεός ἀγαθός*, the form *λώιος* being the positive of the well-known comparative *λῶϊων* or *λῶϊτερος*.² This explanation, though not absolutely certain, seems to me fairly cogent. The stone-mason had, at first, forgotten the customary heading: he inscribed it, as well as he could, after the first line was written. Thus, in interpreting the law's main content, the word may be neglected.

This main content is an attempt to secure that no *kosmos* shall be allowed to hold the office a second time, except after an interval of ten years. An inscription from Gortyn of fairly early date (SGDI 4979, 2) similarly forbids the same man to be *kosmos* twice within three years. The long interval of ten years in Dreros, as the editors explain, may be due to an aristocratic reaction to the danger of tyranny. If they are right, this would show that the little aristocratic Polis was strong enough to defend itself against the attempts of mighty individuals to gain political power. There was the same struggle throughout the whole Greek world; it ended in most of the States at various times during the sixth century, and it ended everywhere in the victory of the Polis. Our text can be fitted into this general situation.

But the next paragraph containing the sanction against a *kosmos* who does not observe the interval of ten years raises a doubt. Rather unsystematically we are told that (1) he must pay the double sum for all his judgements; (2) he shall be deprived of civil rights for his lifetime (this being the sense of *ακρηστος* in the opinion of the editors); (3) all his acts as a *kosmos* shall be null and void.

In the first clause the *kosmos* is referred to in his judicial capacity, mainly, I think, because it appeared that the only way of finding a measure for fines to be inflicted upon him was to debit him with the sum (or some multiple of the sum) of the fines imposed in his judgements. Jurisdiction was one of the various tasks of the *kosmoi*.³ What other tasks had our *kosmos*? We know nothing but the fact that all orders issued by him as *kosmos* were to be null and void (l. 3). Does it mean that even decrees of the whole board ceased to be valid because he had taken part in it? Or that meetings of the council or the assembly were null if he had convened them? I cannot imagine that this was so, but we really do not know. We only know that his most significant task seems to have been to act as a judge, and I believe that a man who is trying to become a tyrant would hardly do so by way of the judge's bench.

¹ *Riv. di filol.* lxvii (1939), 20 ff.

the editors, does, of course, not make sense.

² *θεός ὁ λῶϊων*, though it keeps the reading of

³ Cf. Oehler, *P-W*. xi. 1497 f.

Next, the second sanction: does this really look like a law against tyranny? The man will be neither killed nor banished. But he will become *ακρηστος* = *ἄχρηστος*. The editors' opinion is that this means a real *ἀτιμία*.¹ 'Le mot n'existe pas en Crète, mais la chose existe.' I need not quote the *πολιτευειν* of the *μναμον* in the Code of Gortyn (ix. 33) to prove that there must have been some way of withdrawing citizenship. But I do not believe that the man who was compelled to pay fines, but without loss of his fortune, was really *ἀτιμος*. The word *ἄχρηστος* is nowhere else used for *ἀτιμος*, and we should adhere to its real meaning: an 'unemployable', useless at least in a political sense. I should rather assume that the *ἄχρηστος* was merely not allowed to hold again the office of *kosmos*, or any other office. He became a citizen of minor rights.

To confirm this we must compare the curious paragraph of the Spartan-Tegean treaty, probably belonging to about 550 B.C. (Plut. *qu. Graec.* 5, *qu. Rom.* 52 = Aristot. frg. 592). Here, *μὴ ἐξεῖναι χρηστοὺς ποιεῖν* is explained by Aristotle as *μηδένα ἀποκτινύναι*. This is a very surprising equation, and no doubt the usual way of understanding the phrase was wrong. The use of *χρηστός* here is not the same as on grave-stones, where it is merely an emphatic and devotional address (*χρηστὲ χαῖρε*); nor is it 'a curious euphemistic circumlocution' for the dead,² which, in fact, would be almost impossible in a treaty like this. The right explanation was given by Latte.³ *χρηστός* is the verbal adjective of *χρῆσθαι*, and it means the man against whom everybody is allowed to act as he likes. The *χρηστός* is the outlawed. Latte compares the law of Gortyn (ii. 55): *κρεθθαί οἱ καλεῖον τι*. There we are in Crete again, and it seems peculiar that in one case *free usage* (*κρεθθαί*, etc.), in the other *non-usage* (*α-κρηστος*), should imply something like *atimia*. This seems to be a further reason against the interpretation of the editors, and it may confirm my own. The *χρηστός* is the man to be used (in this case, ill-used): the *ακρηστος* is not to be used. The positive and negative forms are grammatically positive and negative, though in sense they are by no means opposites.

If we can assume, as, I think, is permissible, that the *ἄχρηστος* was a citizen of minor rights, the whole law would not be directed against attempts at tyranny, although it comes near to this. It would be a safeguard of the nobility against individuals backed by their family or *genos*. It implies a struggle within the ruling class, which stood firm by its rules and regulations and the equality of its members, and was able to get rid of any dangerous man by relatively moderate measures.

We know other cases of *kosmoi* being punished, but there only a money penalty is mentioned.⁴ Aristotle (*Pol.* 1272^b3 ff.) tells us that bad *kosmoi* sometimes were expelled by conspiracies of colleagues or of private persons, and that the *kosmoi* were allowed to resign even during their term of office. Expulsion (*ἐκβάλλειν*) may signify the same as banishment; it may also mean a mere expulsion from office, and the last meaning would both fit better into the context of Aristotle, and agree with our interpretation of this inscription. If a *kosmos* resigned, his resignation was surely not, in most cases, voluntary: *expulsion* from office would produce that *ἀκοσμία* (absence of a *kosmos*) which Aristotle envisages as a danger to the State. I believe that these testimonies confirm our conclusion from the present text.

We see the State taking action against any *kosmos* who contravenes the common rule. There might have been some special event unknown to us which drove the Polis to do this. At any rate, if looks as if the *kosmoi*, not the Polis, were the weaker party. No hint is given of that solidarity of the *kosmoi* and the noble families which is known

¹ This explanation is considered probable in the *Addenda* of Liddell-Scott, sub *χρηστός*.

the *Addenda* of Liddell-Scott, sub *ἄχρηστος*.

² Halliday, *Plutarch's Greek Questions*, 50.

³ *Heiliges Recht*, 114. His view is accepted in

⁴ e.g. Code of Gortyn, i. 51 ff. ICret. ix. 1, 104 ff.; xvi. 1, 33; xix. 1, 15 f.

from a
he mig
Our r
resista
aristoc
any un

Th
of the
and Sy
magist
vising
control
vice ve
I agree

We
regards
for the
112).²
τῆς πό
analog
electe
transit
reintro
name o
the rat
seems
the hig

I be
of the c
and tha
taining
institut
ῖσαι. Th
cities, e
the fifty
a coun
most pr
they wo
from ot
of the P
the sma

Nex
sense o
parable
But in

¹ Oehl
script of
Syll.³ 52
As to the
Hell., 193

² Cf. O

Athènes
4599-8

from other sources.¹ If really each kosmos was elected out of a *genos* or a *phyle*, he might be pursuing a family policy in attempting to keep his office for a longer time. Our record proves that the resistance of the other families found expression as a resistance by the State. It is very important to understand that even in this small aristocratic State of the seventh century the Polis was stronger than any family or any union of families.

The new law was confirmed by oath of 'the kosmos, the *damioi*, and the Twenty of the Polis'. The kosmos is no doubt meant, as commonly (see Oehler, loc. cit. 1495 f. and Syll.³ 524¹), in the collective sense: the college of kosmoi. Who are the other magistrates? The editors argue well on this point. There must be an authority supervising the actions of the kosmoi, and there must be some treasurers for financial control. But are the *damioi* the highest officials, the Twenty a financial board—or vice versa? The editors take both solutions to be possible, but prefer the second one. I agree, and I hope to be able to confirm this opinion.

We begin with the Twenty. So far as I know, there is only one analogous case as regards the number, the Twenty elected at Athens after the fall of the Thirty (403 B.C.) for the reorganization of the State (*ἐπιμελείσθαι τῆς πόλεως*) (Andoc. i. 81; Poll. viii. 112).² Although the recurrence not only of the number but of the supplementary *τῆς πόλεως* is rather surprising, at least at first sight, I do not think there is a real analogy between the two cases. The Twenty at Athens were a revolutionary board, elected only once, in a State without assembly and council, as a temporary and transitory committee, merely to select new councillors and magistrates and so to reintroduce democracy. There is no ordinary magistracy known to me under the name of the Twenty or any other similar number. To regard the Twenty as one of the rather frequent small boards of officials, called after the number of its members, seems to me impossible, especially in such a little oligarchic community as Dreros; the highest number that I know is that of the *Hendeka* at Athens.

I believe the editors are not quite on the right track in speaking of a commission of the council. I do not see any reason to assume that the Twenty were a commission, and that the whole *βολά* amounted perhaps to forty members.³ A commission containing half or even more of the whole council would have been a very peculiar institution. Aristotle (1272^a7 ff.) calls the Cretan council and the Spartan *Gerusia* *ἴσαι*. There may have been a *βολά* of thirty, as in Sparta, in some of the larger Cretan cities, e.g. in Cnossus or Gortyn. But there is no reason whatever to believe that all the fifty or more Cretan cities, including the small and remote Polis of Dreros, had a council of thirty, let alone of forty members, as the editors surmise. I think the most probable solution is to consider the Twenty as the council itself.⁴ In that case, they would really be the men *τὰς πόλιος*; for this expression need not imply a difference from other Twenties, but may simply mean that these Twenty were representatives of the Polis. This interpretation would accord with the aristocratic constitution and the smallness of the city, both of them facts which must be reckoned with.

Next, the *damioi*. These, of course, are not *δῆμοι* or *δημόσιοι* in the Athenian sense of the word: public slaves and, in particular, the executioner. More comparable, perhaps, are the *damiorgoi* in the neighbour state of Olus (ICret. xxii. 4). But in Olus we do not hear of kosmoi before the reign of Tiberius (xxii. 12): the

¹ Oehler, loc. cit. 1496. For Dreros cf. the pre-script of the well-known oath (ICret. ix. 1 = Syll.³ 527) *τῶν Αἰθαλεῶν κοσμοντων* (c. 200 B.C.) As to the date see H. van Effenterre, *Bull. Corr. Hell.*, 1937, 327–32, cf. *ibid.* 31.

² Cf. Cloché, *La restauration démocratique à Athènes* (1915), 409.

³ Cf. van Effenterre, 336.

⁴ This *βολά*, as the editors emphasize, is not mentioned elsewhere in our inscription, though it is proved to have been in existence in Dreros in later times by the oath (l. 104) I have quoted above. In this oath the *κοσμοι* are responsible to the Council.

kosmos is then eponymus, whereas earlier the damiorgos had been eponymus (xxii. 4). It looks as if the early damiorgoi are equivalent to the later kosmoi: the fact that damiorgoi are the highest officials in many States supports this, and makes it unlikely that the two magistracies co-existed. We should not, therefore, identify the damioi at Dreros with damiorgoi.

The editors have already hinted at the etymological connexion between δάμιοι and δαμόσιον. May I recall the fact that in Sparta οἱ περὶ δαμόσιον was the name of the people attending the king in war-time and that τὸ δαμόσιον meant something like the economic support of the king's household by the δάμος?¹ In view of the well-known connexions and analogies between Spartan and Cretan constitutions, there is no difficulty at all in taking the damioi to have been an (or better, the) economic and financial magistracy of the small State.

Let me emphasize once more the good and highly advanced organization of Dreros. There is nothing to prove that the noble families played any special part. To be sure, it was a strict aristocracy, and the small number of the councillors seems to demonstrate that the number of the ruling oligarchy, too, was very small. But even if the ruling class of the population was represented only by a few families, they were subordinated to the Polis, to its claims as well as to its formal constitution. The last decision was with the assembly, but real power, as we may believe, rested with the council, and both were rather small bodies. Magistracy had begun to become specialized, and even the highest officials, the kosmoi, powerful as they were, were bound by strict rules and safeguards in the interest of the Polis.²

VICTOR EHRENBERG.

KING'S COLLEGE, NEWCASTLE ON TYNE.

¹ Cf. Ehrenberg, *Hermes*, lxxviii (1933), 293 ff.

² My thanks are due to Prof. Wade-Gery for his kind revision of this article.

THI

OUR ch
as is w
292 E).

from th

ἐν τῷ

γενέθλιο

πολυμάν

δ' ἀπαξ

'Αναξαν

This

on the

period

really r

passage

Flaceliè

dialogu

a mont

once a

always

Takin

is a very

own or

p. 73, n

derived

contrary

fragmen

Delphic

have us

time. T

had alre

existenc

would d

referenc

earlier.

several

¹ *Étud*

l'École d

1938, p. 1

² Flac

poses tha

took plac

B.C. He

the Athe

vii. 140)

evidence

tion cites

τύχην ἡμε

dies nef

described

THE DAYS FOR CONSULTING THE DELPHIC ORACLE

OUR chief evidence for the days on which the Delphic oracle could be consulted comes, as is well known, from a passage in the *Quaestiones Graecae* of Plutarch (*Moralia*, 292 E). He is explaining the name of the Delphic month Bysios, which he derives from the verbs for inquiry (*πυστιῶνται*, *πυνθάνονται*), and adds the comment:

ἐν τῷ μηνὶ γὰρ τούτῳ χρηστήριον ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐβδόμην ταύτην νομίζουσι τοῦ θεοῦ γενέθλιον, καὶ πολὺφθοον ὀνομάζουσι, οὐ διὰ τὸ πέττεσθαι φθόις, ἀλλὰ πολυπενθῇ καὶ πολυμάντετον οὖσαν. ὁψὲ γὰρ ἀνείθησαν αἱ κατὰ μῆνα μαντεῖαι τοῖς δεομένοις, πρότερον δ' ἀπαξ ἐθεμίστενεν ἡ Πυθία τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ κατὰ ταύτην τὴν ἡμέραν, ὡς Καλλισθένης καὶ Ἀναξανδρίδης ἱστοροῦσιν.

This passage states that originally the oracle could only be consulted once a year on the 7th of Bysios, and implies that this restriction was only removed at a late period when consultation once a month was allowed. That αἱ κατὰ μῆνα μαντεῖαι really means consultations only on one day each month is confirmed by another passage in Plutarch (*De Pythiae Oraculis*, 8 = *Moralia*, 398 A), to which Robert Flacelière has lately called renewed attention.¹ There one of the speakers in the dialogue alludes rhetorically to the belief that 'the god is shut in a mortal body once a month'. These passages raise two difficulties: (1) when were the consultations once a year replaced by the monthly inquiries, and (2) were these latter inquiries always confined to a single day in the month?

Taking the chronological question first, Plutarch himself gives us little help. ὁψέ is a very relative term, and unfortunately it is not quite clear whether it is Plutarch's own or derived from Callisthenes or Anaxandridas of Delphi. Flacelière (op. cit., p. 73, note 1) maintains that only the latter part of the sentence from πρότερον is derived from these writers, and hence attributes the ὁψέ to Plutarch. Jacoby on the contrary includes the greater part of the preceding paragraph among Callisthenes' fragments (*F. Gr. Hist.* 124 F 49). But even Plutarch must have thought of the Delphic oracle as having more than 1,600 years of activity behind it, and so could have used the term ὁψέ of a change which had taken place centuries before his own time. The general meaning of the sentence seems to me to imply that the change had already taken place before the time of Callisthenes who put on record the former existence of an annual system which had already become obsolete by his day.² This would date the change at least before the mid-fourth century B.C., and our historical references to consultations show that actually it must be dated even considerably earlier. The first year on which our information is so detailed as to enable us to fix several consultations at different months in the year is 480 B.C. For instance, the

¹ *Études d'Archéologie Grecque*, Annales de l'École des Hautes Études de Gand, tome ii, 1938, p. 106.

² Flacelière (loc. cit.) denies this, and supposes that the change to αἱ κατὰ μῆνα μαντεῖαι took place subsequently to the fourth century B.C. He appears to explain such an instance as the Athenian consultation of 480 B.C. (Hdt. vii. 140) as an exceptional privilege, and as evidence for this kind of extraordinary consultation cites the phrase used in Plu. *Alex.* 14—κατὰ τύχην ἡμερῶν ἀποφράδων οὐσῶν—arguing that the *dies nefastus* (ἡμέρα ἀποφράς) could not be described as κατὰ τύχην, if it was only possible

to consult the oracle on a few specified dates. But this argument would cut logically against both the system of annual and monthly consultations, strictly interpreted. On the other hand, if extraordinary consultations were always possible, except on a few *dies nefasti*, it seems futile for Plutarch to write as if consultation was actually limited to specific dates. The story of Alexander's consultation is silly and apocryphal, and the phrase must not be pressed to mean more than 'as luck would have it, it was a *dies nefastus*', without stating the odds in favour of such a possibility.

Athenian inquiry at Delphi (Hdt. vii. 140) must have taken place after Xerxes left Sardis in the spring, and therefore after the month Bysios which was the equivalent of the Attic month Anthesterion, and so fell approximately from mid-February to mid-March. A likely date would be a couple of months later, after the reconnaissance of the Greeks to Tempe had proved a disappointment.¹ In any case it must be before late July, the time of the battles of Thermopylae and Artemisium. The Delphic consultation in Hdt. vii. 178 appears to have taken place on a different and later occasion nearer in date to Artemisium, and in Hdt. viii. 36 we have yet a third instance of a Delphic consultation still later in the same year. Thus we have good evidence for three consultations in 480 B.C., all probably later than Bysios. Similarly in 479 the oracle recorded in Plutarch (*Aristides*, 11. 3 ff.) was probably delivered after Mardonius' reoccupation of Athens in May or June of that year and before Plataea was fought on 27th August.

To show that the practice of consultation at other times than the month Bysios did not lapse again after the fifth and fourth centuries, we may cite two instances.

(1) Q. Fabius Pictor was sent from Rome in 216 B.C. after the battle of Cannae had been fought in August, and he returned again before winter (Livy, xxiii. 11. 1 ff.). (2) In 37 B.C. the Athenian γένος of the Gephyraei recorded in an inscription a covering letter from the Delphic authorities which accompanied an answer of the oracle to their inquiry. This record was dated to the month Skirophorion (i.e. the 4th month after Bysios), and one can suppose that the inquiry itself had taken place in that month.² If so, it is the only Delphic response for which a month is actually named in our authorities.

Evidently αἱ κατὰ μῆνα μαντεῖαι were practised at least from the early fifth century throughout subsequent periods. On the other hand, as Plutarch in the evidence of Callisthenes and Anaxandridas dates their introduction 'late' (ὀψέ), one will be disinclined to push the date of their institution too far back into the archaic period. In the sixth century there were two critical points of Delphic history at either of which a change of this sort might have occurred: one was the rebuilding of the temple after 548 B.C., the other was the First Sacred War (ending in 590 B.C.). Here one may perhaps draw a conjecture from one of the authorities cited by Plutarch. Callisthenes may, of course, have mentioned this fact of Delphic history at any point in a number of his lost works, but there was one where it would be particularly likely that he might discuss the subject. His *περὶ τοῦ Ἱεροῦ Πολέμου*, whether it was a special section of his *Hellenica* or not, contained an account of the Third Sacred War, which was illustrated by a digression on the First Sacred War. We have a fragment (*F. Gr. Hist.* 124 F 1) in which he assigns causes for the earlier war, and I would conjecture that in this place he recorded the change in the times of consulting the oracle as a consequence of the same war. If the alteration took place in 590 B.C., the occasion would have been highly appropriate. For through the destruction of Crisa and the final establishment of Amphictyonic control Delphi became thenceforward a fully Panhellenic centre. This development was emphasized by the conversion of the old eight-yearly local Pythian festival into the four-yearly Pythian games, and it would be quite suitable if at the same period the consultation of the oracle instead of being annual became monthly.

The actual instances of inquiries known from the sixth or earlier centuries do not give exact data to check this theory. I cannot find any instance where a genuine Delphic oracle of the period before 480 B.C. can be securely dated to a month, or even be shown with probability to have been delivered at another season than early spring. But it is worth while to remark that much of the business attributed to the oracle in

¹ Cf. Munro, *C.A.H.* iv, pp. 283 and 300.

² *I.G.* ii². 1096 and *Hesperia*, ix, 1940, pp. 86 ff.

the period before 590 B.C. concerned the sending out of colonies. Considering the Greek practice of beginning the sailing season in late March, it would be highly appropriate if the Pythia was consulted on the subject just before the earliest date at which an expedition was likely to set sail.

If we take it, then, that the change from the annual to the monthly system of consultations was probably made about 590 B.C. but in any case before 480, we may ask whether the change meant that thenceforward Apollo could be consulted monthly, but only on one day in the month.¹ As we have seen, Plutarch gives good evidence that this was the practice in his own day, and implies that this custom had followed immediately on the abandonment of annual consultations. Modern scholars, however, have found it difficult to credit that the oracle in the classical period was only available so infrequently.² This is a subject on which no evidence can safely be drawn from particular instances. We have noted above the best example when more than one consultation is known to have taken place in a year, but even then it is impossible to show what was the day of the month for each or whether the inquiries were made at less than a month's interval from each other. There are, however, two instances from Herodotus which present a little difficulty, if it is supposed that one day only a month was assigned for inquiries.

(1) The two responses delivered to the Athenian embassy in 480 B.C. must on this hypothesis have been given within the space of one day. Halliday (op. cit., p. 61) regards this as out of the question, and quotes this instance as disproving the possibility of this restriction. But I do not myself find it hard to believe that the two consultations were separated by no longer interval than a few hours, in which the Delphic authorities had time to reconsider their decision under pressure from the Athenian embassy.

(2) Croesus' famous test by sending an embassy to consult a number of oracles on the hundredth day after leaving Sardis would not work, unless the hundredth day by chance or previous calculation fell on the 7th of the month. But the story of Croesus' experiment is not to be taken as literally true. It is a pious invention of the Delphians to increase the glory of the Pythian Apollo at the expense of other oracles. Hence I do not suppose that those who invented this legend stopped to think how it would work by the calendar.

If we put aside these special instances as indecisive, there remain only general considerations in favour or against the view that the Pythia could only be consulted once a month in the historic period. F. Sokolowski³ has well expressed the view in

¹ Plutarch elsewhere (*Moralia*, 389 c) mentions Apollo's absence from Delphi for the three winter months. So it must be taken that when he refers to *ai kata mēna manreiai* he does not include the period mid-November to mid-February. For other references cf. Parke, *A History of the Delphic Oracle*, p. 15, n. 4, and see a discussion of the point in Halliday, *Plutarch's Greek Questions*, p. 62.

² e.g. Halliday, op. cit., pp. 61 ff. Contrast Farnell, *Greek Cults*, vol. iv, p. 186, who seems to accept Plutarch's evidence rather hesitantly. Halliday distinguishes three periods: (1) when consultations only took place on 7th Busios, (2) when consultations took place on all days except a few *hēmerai apoφράδες*, (3) *ai kata mēna manreiai* of Plutarch's time. But though Plutarch, *Alex.* 14 (cf. *supra*, p. 19, n. 2), is the only source of literary evidence which he produces for the second period, Plutarch himself in

the *Moralia* only recognized two periods, i.e. (1) and (3). This is proved, as R. Vallois points out (*B.C.H.* lv, 1931, p. 335) by Plutarch's use of *πρότερον*, not *πρώτον*, in referring to the former period. Vallois does not like to confine the consultation to a single day a month, but supposes that, as in some festivals, the original day was extended. This theory, as Flacelière suggests, ignores the second passage cited above from the *Moralia* (398 A). Plutarch, *Alex.* 14, is the only reference extant to actual *hēmerai apoφράδες* at Delphi. The question of the days allowed by rule for consultation must not be confused by citing passages which refer to the sacrifice, which was always offered before consultation to ascertain whether Apollo was willing to answer. e.g. Halliday cites Eur. *Ion*, 418, which refers to this. For other references see Parke, *Delphic Oracle*, p. 21, n. 2.

³ *B.C.H.*, 1936, pp. 139-40, quoted by Flacelière, op. cit., p. 107.

favour of frequent opportunities of consultation. 'Les jours où la consultation était suspendue étaient l'exception, non la règle, et il n'était pas de l'intérêt des prêtres de les multiplier et de fermer l'oracle à la foule des gens qui la consultaient sur les questions les plus banales.' On this supposition the interested motives of the Delphic priesthood are taken to have been sufficient to guarantee that they would put the minimum of restrictions on the consultation of the oracle. But first of all one must recognize that if the oracle had once been open for inquirers only on a single day of the year, then to throw it open monthly was a considerable increase. Also can we be sure that the Delphic priesthood (even supposing they were governed by self-interest rather than traditional scruples) would have acted on the possibly misleading principle of encouraging wholesale inquiry? The amount of business would thereby be increased, but the prestige of the oracle might to some extent be strengthened by the opposite method—by making its consultation a matter of some difficulty, a rather rare privilege to be valued accordingly.

In support of this view one may note two considerations. (1) Plutarch (*Moralia*, 414 B), contrasting contemporary conditions at Delphi with the days when Greece was more populous, remarks that then *δυσὶν ἐχρῶντο προφήτισιν ἐν μέρει καθιεμέναις, καὶ τρίτῃ δ' ἐφεδρος ἦν ἀποδεδειγμένη*. This description suggests a picture of continuous consultation throughout the day with two Pythiae taking shifts in turn at answering questions, while a third was held in reserve in case either of the principals had to retire. Surely if the oracle could be consulted on most days of the year, the pressure of business was not ordinarily so severe as to call for such a system? On the other hypothesis, if all the inquiries for a month had to be gone through in the period between sunrise and sunset on one day, the urgency becomes easily intelligible.

(2) One may also cite the institution of *προμαντεία*. This grant of precedence as an inquirer figures prominently in the literature and inscriptions of Delphi, but its exact purpose and value is never defined. Certainly the right to approach the oracle before others is an obvious form of honour, and might have been regularly conferred no matter what were the exact rules governing the consultation. But the privilege of precedence takes on a special significance and importance, if we suppose that the oracle could be consulted only once a month, and that often the throng of inquirers was numerous. Under such circumstances we may presume that those possessing the *προμαντεία* might claim precedence over all those without it, and perhaps those who had held the right longest ranked as superior to later recipients. The Delphians themselves claimed the first place, and occasionally as a special privilege conceded the place immediately after them to one particular city.¹ The consequence would follow that those possessing *προμαντεία* would be practically assured of an answer to their inquiry on any occasion, but the ordinary class of inquirers had to determine their relative positions by lot,² and possibly, if the press of business was great, those at the end had to postpone their consultation for a month.

This view of the circumstances under which the Pythia was consulted has not commended itself to most recent writers on the subject. But it may deserve more serious consideration than it has received. It has the merit of taking Plutarch's statements literally, and Plutarch was intimately acquainted with Delphi and cited as one authority the chief native Delphian writer on the subject. Also this interpretation gives more meaning to the institution of *προμαντεία*, and does not conflict seriously with any recorded instances of consultation.

TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

H. W. PARKE.

¹ e.g. the Thebans in 363 B.C.; *B.C.H.* xxix. 1899, p. 517; Ditt. *Syll.*³ 176.

² Aesch. *Eum.* 32; Parke, *Delphic Oracle*, p. 39, n. 10.

PAPY
In the
some
from
comm
de Ca
editor
attest
in 19
and e
Callin
there

For
mythe
poem
Αἰήτη
in sch
of the
cians,
seeme
The f
was in
in pa
On th
in l. 7
ἀπ' 'P
pressi
appea
Hera
Zephy
dange
playe
of geo
papyr
the na
the so

¹ Th
Oxford
I am
improv

² Pro
some 6
tablet,
Vienna
Kallim
nuper

³ Re
Nicole
Ali in C

A FRAGMENT OF PARTHENIOS' ARETE¹

PAPYRUS Geneva 97 is still believed to be the earliest find of Callimachus' *Aitia*.² In the years 1896 and 1904 Jules Nicole acquired in Egypt for the library in Geneva some pieces of papyri and parchments. One of his acquisitions was the remainder from the top of a double leaf of a vellum codex, containing elegiac lines with marginal comments. The first edition appeared in 1904 with the title 'Un fragment des Aetia de Callimaque'³ presenting scraps of more than forty lines; but neither the first editor nor anyone else succeeded in identifying any of them with any of the well-attested Callimachean fragments.⁴ This may not have worried Nicole very much in 1904. But since then thirty papyri have turned up with the text of lost poems⁵ and every single piece of them, even the smallest, could be clearly identified as Callimachean by coincidence with a known quotation. For the Geneva parchment there is no evidence up to to-day, and its case remains absolutely unique.

For lack of evidence, the first editor had to treat the matter by reasoning. From mythological and geographical names in the scholia he concluded that the elegiac poem was a narrative one; he read on the margin of col. i. 2 the name *αυρης* i.e. *Αιρης* and in the following cursive note to i. 4-6 the name 'Αρήτη, which occurs again in schol. col. ii. 9. The combination of these two names led of necessity to the story of the Argonauts: they came fleeing the wrath of Aietes to the island of the Phaeacians, where Arete was queen. Strangely enough, in the new fragment the queen seemed to be dead (schol. i. 4-6) and her husband in great distress (schol. ii. 7-9). The fact that Callimachus had inserted some Argonautic adventures into his *Aitia* was in 1904 known from old fragments, and now it is confirmed by recent papyri; in particular, we always had four quotations referring to the Phaeacian island.⁶ On the upper margin of col. i Nicole imagined he saw traces of the name *Θέτις* and in l. 7 of the text he amplified *ἀργυ* to *ἀργυρόπεζα*; in l. 8 he read *ηφ* and supplied *ἀν* 'Ηφ[αίστου. The person full of sorrows in ll. 3-4 he supposed to be Hera, expressing her anxiety for the fate of Jason and his companions. As the name of Iris appears in l. 15 and her husband Zephyrus in the marginal note to this line, he thought Hera advised Iris to give messages to Thetis (l. 7), to Hephaestus (l. 8), and to Zephyrus (l. 15) as to how they could help the Argonauts to come through various dangers to the Phaeacian isle. He referred to passages in Apoll. Rh. iv, where Hera played a similar part, esp. 757 ff. There was some difficulty in reconciling a number of geographical names in the scholia with this theory. The theory was that the papyrus dealt with the prospective and then with the actual arrival in Kerkyra. But the names of places and rivers mentioned in the notes to cols. i and ii are localities on the south shore of the Black Sea or near to it; Nicole suggested that Nicaea in schol.

¹ The substance of this paper was read to the Oxford Philological Society on 5 June 1942. I am indebted to Mr. W. Phelps, who read and improved my manuscript.

² Previously there had been published only some 60 new lines of his *Hecale* from a wooden tablet, found near Arsinoe in 1877, now in Vienna: Th. Gomperz, *Aus der Hekale des Kallimachos*, Wien, 1893; *Callimachi fragmenta nuper reperta*, ed. R. Pfeiffer, Bonn, 1923, fr. 34.

³ *Revue des Études grecques*, xvii. 215-29; Nicole even mentions the dealer, a man called Ali in Gizeh, but it is not quite clear whether he

brought this piece back from his first or second journey. About Nicole's purchases: K. Preisendanz, *Papyrusfunde und Forschungen*, Leipzig, 1933, p. 234. Compare the acquisition of the London fragment, below, p. 30.

⁴ There were at Nicole's time about 600 such fragments from ancient quotations in O. Schneider's exhaustive collection, *Callimachea*, ii. 1873.

⁵ See the summary of my paper on 'Callimachus', read to the Classical Association on 23 April 1941, *Proceedings*, vol. xxxviii, pp. 7 ff.

⁶ Fr. 336, 377, 554, 563 Schn.

i. 4 may be an Illyrian Nicaea,¹ and that the other names, which cannot be so easily transferred to western places, may have belonged to a speech of Jason in Kerkyra, relating the voyage of the ship *Argo* in the east. This is the rather ingenious and inventive interpretation of the first editor; furthermore, he observed that the poet apparently avoided the traditional epic language, that the vocabulary is post-classic, and that in particular *τοῦράκι* is a favourite word of Callimachus.

The text in my *Callimachi fragmenta nuper reperta*, nr. 5, had to be established on the basis of Nicole's and Martin's readings² with some alterations and supplements, and in a chapter on the Argonauts I tried to justify the attribution to the *Aitia*.³ My particular points were: there is no objection on metrical grounds; the end of a sentence after the first dactyl, three times attested by punctuation in the papyrus, is quite Callimachean; we do not know of any other Greek elegiac poem that was commented on, except the *Aitia*. Then I worked out the relation of the new piece to Apollonios' fourth book: I came to the conclusion that the presumed dialogue of the first column is not one between Hera and Iris but one between Hera and Thetis, in which Iris is mentioned in the third person. I compared Apoll. Rh. iv. 783 ff. and supposed that Arete is not dead but just away from home,⁴ and is being recalled by Hera to assist Jason and Medea.

There arose only one critic: Wilamowitz in his book on *Hellenistic Poetry*, in which he thoroughly discussed the Geneva fragment in the chapter on Apollonios.⁵ He admitted that it was no bad argument to stress the fact that we could not expect any other elegiac poems to be fitted with such learned scholia in the late times of the Empire except Callimachus' *Aitia*; he also said that at first sight he found the reconstruction of Hera's advice to Thetis on the basis of Apoll. Rh. iv. 783 ff. rather attractive. On the other hand, he definitely rejected the idea of the queen's temporary absence ('Married women do not go on a journey'). Then going through text and scholia line by line, he ended in complete scepticism, suspending his judgement on the subject as well as on the writer.⁶ Wilamowitz's mistrust of the previous interpretations, his feeling that, in spite of some sensible arguments, something was wrong, now turns out to have been very well founded indeed.

But at the time of publication I was little impressed by Wilamowitz's opposition, and Mr. E. Lobel took no notice of his objections when he put together seven manuscripts containing portions from the beginning of the first book of the *Aitia*.⁷ He included the Geneva parchment because we had just learned from two Florentine papyri that Argonautic adventures were told as the second Aition of the first book, and he did not call in question either the content, suggested by the previous editors, nor the ascription to Callimachus.⁸

¹ Steph. Byz. v. *Νίκαια* . . . *τρίτη ἐν Ἰλλυρίδι* is the only reference to this place.

² Professor V. Martin very kindly revised the original at my request; he especially improved the only one of Nicole's readings, ii. 13, which would have been an obstacle to ascribing the fragment to any decent poet, not to mention Callimachus. His information about the scholia was rather discouraging.

³ *Kallimachosstudien*, München, 1922, pp. 65-71.

⁴ Schol. i. 4-6 ἀπόχετο for ἀπόλετο; see below, p. 26.

⁵ *Hellenistische Dichtung*, ii (1924), pp. 174-6.

⁶ The result was negative, but for Wilamowitz important in so far as Apollonios had once more been rescued from the suspicion of being a too close imitator of Callimachus. In this general tendency to overstate the independence of Apollonios, Wilamowitz was not very lucky; there is, if required, still more evidence against him in the last Oxyrhynchus volume.

⁷ 'Callimachea', *Hermes*, lxx, 1935, pp. 31 ff.

⁸ 'There seem to be implications of an arrival, actual or prospective, in Phaeacia', l.c. p. 37 with the footnote: 'This is what would be naturally inferred from the mention in two scholia of Arete. On the other hand, the mentions of Nicaea . . . of Lycus . . . of Kales . . . are consistent with the notion that the Argonauts are still on the south shore of the Pontus.'

In reprinting the text he was able to use a new photograph¹ and made substantial improvements by new readings and his rejection of others as impossible or doubtful. Quite recently Mr. Lobel himself published three new fragments referring to the Argonautic part of the first book of the *Aitia*, one of them even to the Phaeacian isle. They can now all be combined with Florentine and Berlin fragments and definitely placed; but Pap. Geneva 97 is, as Mr. Lobel incidentally remarked,² still unplaced among the Argonautic fragments of the *Aitia*.

I now hope we can remove it for ever from any connexion with the *Aitia* and put it in its proper place. The editions of the text already quoted are to a certain degree misleading, since they imply an Argonautic adventure as subject and Callimachus as author; so I shall give a revised text and then the result of the revision.

Fol. 1

Col. i (= recto)	Col. ii (= verso)
οὐ μὲν[. .] . . [] . ρ . [.] ηδε
κεῖνον ὅτις . [] .
κῆδεά μοι μ[] σε με νεῖσθαι
τρύομαι· εχ[] φόρος
5 νεῖσομαι· εφ[με] τανάσται 5
αὐτίκα· καὶ φα[] πόλιν
καὶ νῦ μοι ἀργυ[βεβολ]ημένος ἄζη
πρηῖς ἀπη . [] ἦς
μηδ' ὄγε κο[] ασα
10 τουτάκι μη[] Λύκον 10
ἀλλὰ μιν ἀμ . [] ἡγύνησε
ἃ φίλος εἶρη[] ους
στέλλεο κα[] λε . ο λοῖσθον
σήμερον α[] . ονας
15 *Ιρίς τοι κ[] . . [.] . . ἔχουσα 15
Κύ]πριν . []
.....

Schol. Col. i in marg. sinistr. et inter lineas ad 2 potius ἀκρης quam ἀκτης 4-6 τὴν Νίκ(αι)αν
 ἐρλ . | ἀπώλετο | γ(ᾶρ) ἡ Ἀρήτη | ε . λ() ἐτάραξε 8 . ηω . . (?) 15 τὸν Ζέφ(υρον) . ἐκεῖ|νω
 γ(ᾶρ) ἐγα|μῆθη ἡ Ἰρίς 16 vestigia notae marg.

Col. ii in marg. sup.] . ελασο vel ελεχο |]ς ἔθηκε το | in marg. dextra ad 2
 αρ . [.] (ἀρ[ε]τος) Nic. · διὰ τὸ ἐν | χει[μ]ῶνι πρῆστανται 5 Ἀθηναῖοι 7-9 ξηρασία | λύπη
 διὰ | τὴν ἀπου|σίαν τῆς | Ἀρήτης 11-15 πύρρος ἀπὸ | εὐθείας τοῦ πύ|ρρος εαν . . . |
 πύρρος | ὡς ἀπὸ εὐθείας | τοῦ πύρρος · ἀλλὰ μεταπλα|σμός (ἔστιν) ὡς | χρυσάρματα | ἐρυσάρματα
 inter 12 et 13 schol. vestigia, nil nisi δε . et ανεσθ() legi potest. ad 16 Κάλ(ης) ποταμ(ός)
 Μυθονί|ας περὶ Βιθυνίαν et aliud schol. quod iam legi nequit.

utrum foliorum coniunctorum prius fuerit in codice, non constat neque ordo paginarum statui potest Col. i 2 γ[] vel fort. π[] 4 ἐχ[] vel ἐχ[] 7 νύ 8 ω[], vix φ[] (L.) ἀπ' ἡμέ|ης . . . ἄλός Pf. 12 ἀφίλοισιν[] superscr. litt. ε ommissa inter c et ι 16 suppl. Pf. Col. ii. 5 suppl. Wil. Hell. Dicht. ii. 175 et L. coll. Herod. vii. 161 7 suppl. Pf. 11 corr. ex ἡγύνησε 13 λ vel δ fort. ετο 15 fort. ἰορέχ (L.) ἦτ]ρη ἔχουσα e.g. Pf.

¹ For this photograph he expressed his thanks to the authorities of the Geneva library, and I have to thank him for letting me use the photograph when I tried to go again through these old

scraps.

² *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. xviii, 1941, p. 47. Cf. PSI 1217 A, fr. 2+B; 1219, fr. 1, 38 ff. *P. Oxy.* 2167, fr. 2, col. ii; 2167, fr. 3; 2168.

Fol. 2

Col. iii (= verso)

.....
 ἐκβλεπ[
 μαλκ[
 καιρο[
 c . c . . oc[

Col. iv (= recto)

]δῆρον
]oc
]ic .
] . ευ .
] . . ε 5
]ς
]σαν
] . .
]oc
] 10

Schol. Col. iii reliquiae parum clarae in marg. sup. et sinistr. Col. iv in marg. sup.]αιc
 ἐχθροί . [(L.) in marg. dextr. 2-4]αλαε |] . και |]θερο |]εα ἔργα | . . ? . .] . ε αρμα|τίδες
 γὰρ αἱ | . . ? . . αὖ οἰκοῦσαι. 6 καὶ *Ομ(ηρος) πλω|τῇ ἐνὶ νῆσῳ (κ 3) 7 ὑψηλά 8
 πρωτεία 9 vix quicquam legi potest (. . . . γει |) 10]ομό.

inter fol. 1 et 2 unum vel plur. fol. dupl. in codice fuisse possunt; partem eiusdem elegiae esse minime constat. Ad Pontum referre videtur, si recte legitur, schol. iv. 2-4 *Σαρματίδες* = Amazones? cf. Ephor. 70 F. gr. Hist. 60 ap. Steph. Byz. **Ἀμαζόνες* . . . ἅς τῶν *Σαυροματίδας* κατοῦσιν al. 6 *πλωτὴ νῆσος* κ 3 Aeoli insula; vocab. varias habet exposit., v. schol. et Eust. ad l.; in Ap. Rh. ii. 285, 297 (c. schol.) Strophades ins. sunt *πλωταί*; in Call. hy. iv. 36. 213 Delus ins. *πελάγεσσιν ἐπέπλεε*; Schol. Ap. Rh. iv. 41-3 τὸ παλαιὸν αἱ νῆσοι πᾶσαι ἐπλανῶντο.

First of all, there is no *αὐτης* (= *Αἰήτης*) on the left margin of i. 2. After *α* the top of a letter is preserved, probably a cursive *κ* (hardly a cursive *β*), then *ρ* seems to me a little more likely than *τ*, *η* is certain, and finally there is a very small round letter, apparently a *ς*, quite close to the first letter of the text. However ambiguous the marginal note remains,¹ the king of the Colchians has disappeared. Next, on the upper margin of col. i nobody after Nicole succeeded in finding any trace of the name *Θέτις*, either in the original or in the photograph, though one can still guess which shades of the parchment Nicole had taken for pale ink ('peut-être' Thetis). Again, *ἀργυ* in l. 7 does not by any means imply *ἀργυρόπεζα* in an elegiac poem which otherwise avoids the traditional epic language; only classicists used this typically Homeric epithet for *Θέτις*. In l. 8 the letter after *η* does not look at all like the left-hand curve of *φ*, and Nicole's suggestion *ἀπ'* *Ἡφ[αίστου*² becomes most improbable. So after Aietes and Thetis, Hephaestus has gone as well. Thetis and Hephaestus were only supplementary figures in the reconstruction of the Argonautic story, but Aietes was a vital personage. The whole theory was based on the combination of the king of Colchis with the queen of the Phaeacian island. If we remove the king, the structure collapses.

Luckily, Arete has not vanished. Her name had been correctly deciphered in the scholia i. 4-6 and ii. 7-9. But why should she be the Phaeacian queen? The entire mythical background which suggested that she was no longer exists. In the first place we read *ἀπώλετο γ(ὰρ) ἡ Ἀρήτη*. This is what Nicole and Martin had deciphered; but in my edition, as I could not imagine that any Greek poet had risked changing the Phaeacian myth so seriously, I conjectured *ἀπώχετο*. 'Very easy change,'

¹ One is tempted to think of the Bithynian *Μέλαινα* **Ἀκρη* (v.l. **Ἀκτῆ*), schol. Ap. Rh. ii. 349, Arrian, *Peripl. Pont.* 17, etc., comparing the other Bithynian place-names in our fragment.

² The retention of the tenuis *ἀπ'* instead of *ἀφ'* would be strange but not impossible: cf. Apollon. Dysc. *de adv.* Gr. Gr. i. 1, p. 152, 21 *ἐπ'* **Ἡφαίστω θύρῃ* and *de coni.*, Gr. Gr. i. 1, p. 238.

remarked Wilamowitz,¹ 'but a Greek scholiast would hardly use this poetical word for ἀπεδήμηνεν.' The word ἀπώλετο, which seems to me fairly certain,² was used in both poetry and prose, and I should think we have to acknowledge that the Arete in question had died, perhaps by some accident.³ It appears from the other marginal note (ii. 7) that some male person was stricken with grief διὰ τὴν ἀπουσίαν τῆς Ἀρήτης, and that means here 'because of her absence for ever, her loss, her death'.⁴ The whereabouts of this Arete are revealed in the first scholion (i. 4) by the place-name which had been properly deciphered by Nicole: τὴν Νίκαιαν, though neither he nor anyone else had been able to reconcile this place with the Phaeacian island. Wilamowitz had rightly emphasized that Nicaea does not match with Kerkyra. There is, however, another Arete, not immortalized by a genius like the writer of the Phaeacian books of our *Odyssey*, but celebrated by a minor poet and still a dim figure in ancient literary history. This Arete No. 2 has the advantage of being closely associated with the famous city Nicaea,⁵ the μητρόπολις τῆς Βιθυνίας (Strab. xii. 565). The name of the poet now suggests itself: it is Parthenios, a native of Nicaea, who wrote one or even two elegiac poems in honour of his wife, called Arete (see below, Suid. v. Παρθένιος).

There are, as already mentioned, some more geographical names in our fragment. Schol. ii. 16 'Kales' is explained as a river τῆς Μυγδονίας περὶ Βιθυνίαν, to distinguish this Asiatic Mygdonia from the Macedonian Mygdonia: see Arrian, *Bithyn.* fr. 20 M., id. *Peripl. Pont.* 18, Anonym. *Peripl. Pont.* 9. If in the text ii. 10 Λύκων is a proper name, as I once suggested and Mr. Lobel accepted, it probably refers to the river of the Mariandyni, a tribe of the north-eastern part of Bithynia: see Arrian, *Peripl. Pont.* 18; Anonym. *Peripl. Pont.* 9; schol. Ap. Rh. ii. 724 and especially Ammian. Marcell. xxii. 8, 14 'Lycus fluuius . . . in Bithynia, quam veteres dixere Mygdoniam'. This admirably conforms to the schol. ii. 16 on 'Kales'. Wilamowitz, who had no prejudice for Bithynia, conjectured that schol. ii. 2-3, if it gives an etymology of ἄρκτος, may refer to Ἀρκτων νῆσος, that is Cyzicus according to Plin. *N.H.* v. 142 and Steph. Byz. s.v., and may be combined with the following schol. ii. 5 Ἀθηναῖοι, as there was an early Athenian colonization of this place, according to schol. Ap. Rh. i. 959.⁶ In this case there would have been a word like Κοδρεῖδαι, Κεκροπίδαι in the text, and Cyzicus with Athenian μετανάσται,⁷ on the western border of Bithynia, would not be too far from Nicaea. So we get a fairly harmonious picture of the geographical horizon, while the Phaeacian-Argonautic theory had led to insoluble contradictions. We have no more than 48 short quotations from Parthenios' poems,⁸ but precisely half of them are geographical names in Steph. Byz. and in the schol.

¹ *Hellenist. Dicht.* ii. 175.

² The letter after ω looks exactly like a cursive λ; but even if it were a χ, in prose ἀποίχεσθαι seems to have been used only for 'being dead' *SIG*³, 1219, 10; Plut. *Anton.* c. 31.

³ We read e.g. in the *Epitaph. Adon.* ἀπώλετο καλὸς Ἀδωνις and in the *Epitaph. Bion.* ἀπώλετο Δάριος Ὁρφεύς.

⁴ In the text, ii. 7, I once suggested βεβόλη-μένος ἄζη; that was approved by Wilamowitz as well as by Lobel. One may compare A.P. vii. 145. 3 (attributed to Asclepiades) θυμὸν ἄχει μεγάλῳ βεβόλημένη. I have no exact parallel for the use of ἀπουσία in the schol. ii. 7; there is, however, a v. l. in Eur. *Hec.* 312 ἐπεὶ δ' ἄπεστι Αἰδωλέ cett. codd., namely Achilles who is dead.

⁵ Everyone took τὴν Νίκαιαν in schol. i. 4 as a place-name. We cannot exclude the possibility of its being a female proper name; if so, it would

refer to the nymph Nicaea or to Antipater's younger daughter, both said to be eponyms of the Bithynian city, and it would not make any difference.

⁶ Schol. Ap. Rh. i. 955/60 e. Νηλεῖδαι] οἱ μετὰ Νηλέως τοῦ Κόδρου ἀποικῆσαντες ἐκ τῆς Ἀττικῆς Ἰωνες. In connexion with the Argonautic theory Mr. Lobel referred to Pontic Athens, Steph. Byz. v. Ἀθῆναι, Arrian, *Peripl. Pont.* 4 ff.

⁷ μετανάσται at the end of the hexameter in Nonn. 41. 365 means the Roman immigrants and colonizers of Berytos: Βερόη . . . ἦν μετανάσται | υἱέες Ἀδωνίων . . . | Βηρυτὸν καλεῖσιν.

⁸ Parthen. Nic. ed. E. Martini (*Mythographi Graeci*, vol. ii, fasc. i, Supplem., Lipsiae, 1902). Martini's text repeated with Engl. translation in Loeb's Library, vol. lxix, by S. Gaselee, 1916. Selection of 26 fragments in E. Diehl, *Anthologia lyrica Graeca*, ii, 1925, pp. 240-6. There is

Dionys. Per. Consequently, we should not be too much surprised, if there is a good deal of geography also in the Geneva fragment.

So far we have had to draw the new conclusions chiefly from the scholia. In the parts of the text itself that have been preserved it has always been obvious that somebody complained of great sorrows. The Argonautic theory assumed that in col. i Hera expressed her anxiety for the fate of Jason and his companions, and that in col. ii the male person 'stricken with grief' was King Alcinous. But things turn out to be much simpler. The word *κήδεα* i. 3 refers to the mourning for the dead as usually in Greek poetry; the mourner is the poet himself, expressing his *κήδεα* in an *ἐπικήδειον*, a funeral poem for his dead wife Arete in elegiacs. That is exactly what we read in Suid. v. Παρθένιος . . . Νικαεύς¹ . . . ἔγραψε δὲ ἐλεγείας,² Ἀφροδίτην, Ἀρήτης ἐπικήδειον τῆς γαμετῆς, Ἀρήτης ἐγκώμιον ἐν τρισὶ βιβλίοις. καὶ ἄλλα πολλά. There may be a reference to the epicedium in the famous inscription with which Hadrian honoured the poet Parthenios³ if Kaibel's supplements are right: l. 4 [πολλὰ] δ' ἔ[π'] Ἀ[ρήτ]ῃ μ[υ]ράμενον φθιμένῃ. When the schol. Pind. I. ii. 68 quote Παρθένιος ἐν τῇ Ἀρήτῃ τὸ "ἀννεμε" ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνάγνωθι, they may indeed refer to the 'Enkomion';⁴ no other quotation seems to exist.

So little of the elegiac lines can be read that the structure of the lament remains obscure. But perhaps hints at a few details are possible. If a sentence ends in i. 5 with *νείκομαι* and a note on the margin of i. 4 explains τὴν Νικαίαν, Parthenios seems to have been away from the city; ii. 3 *με νείεσθαι* would not disagree with this assumption. Nothing suggests that he already was in the western world; on the contrary, all that we can read points to the Pontus. The supplement suggested to i. 8 would mean 'gentle from the eastern sea'⁵ and one is reminded of Cicero's famous line (*ad Att.* vii. 2. 1) 'flavit ab Epiro lenissimus Onchesmites'. On the other hand, *πρηῦς* is the typical epithet of Zephyrus in four epigrams of the *Anthology*.⁶ The god Zephyrus actually turns up in the marginal note i. 15 as the husband of Iris, the only mythical figure appearing in the text. Iris is quite suitable to a funeral ode, as she calls the Zephyr and the North Wind to the funeral pile of Patroclus, *Ψ* 200. At the beginning of the following line i. 16 I am inclined to read *Κύπριν*; it is Iris who brings Aphrodite safely back from the battlefield *E* 352, and it is Zephyrus who conveys Aphrodite immediately after her birth at Cythera to Cyprus [*Hom.*] *Hymn. Ven.* 3;

a so-called 'new fragment' in Et. gen. A. v. Οἰταῖον ὄρος. καὶ 'Οἰταῖος' ὁ ἀπὸ τῆς Οἰτῆς παρὰ Παρθενίῳ: R. Reitzenstein, who quoted it, *R-E* vi (1909), p. 99, and *Sitz. Ber. Heidelberger Akad.*, 1912, p. 3, combined it with Catull. 62. 7 and attributed it to Parthenios' Hymenaeus, fr. 32 M. Wilamowitz's scepticism against this combination is well justified, *Hellenist. Dicht.* ii, p. 279, 2. As a matter of fact, this fragment was already known from Tittmann's 'Zonaras' (1808), p. 1435, quoted by Martini, p. 80, as referring to the love story xxv, and Miller's remark (*Mélanges*, 1868, p. 225) should have shown that it was derived from the Et. gen. (B). It is fairly certain that such a quotation in the Etym. refers to a poem and ought to be added to the collection of Parthenios' poetical fragments.

¹ So in Steph. Byz. v. Νικαία, in Suid. v. Νέκρω Λαπαρδεύς and in the title as well as in the subscription of the love stories in the Palatine MS. 398. About Parthenios' connexion with Myrlea or Aramea see G. Kaibel, *Hermes*,

xi, 1876, p. 372 f.

² About v.l. and conj. see A. Adler, Suid. iv (1935), p. 58. 14; the best MSS. read δὲ ἐλεγείας and Artemidor., *Oneirocr.* c. 63 quotes παρὰ Παρθενίῳ ἐν ταῖς ἐλεγείαις (test. 5 M.).

³ *IG* xiv. 1089 (test. 8 Mart., who gives further references); G. Kaibel's ingenious reconstruction is based on Gruter's publication of F. Ursinus' copy. The line quoted is restored with some probability; but I cannot see how the letters of ll. 1-3, as far as they are preserved, support his theory that the full text of the epicedium had once been written on the original inscription, afterwards destroyed, and superseded by Hadrian's own epigram.

⁴ We are not entitled to identify the epicedium and the encomium by some simple textual manipulations in Suidas' article (see Martini to fr. 1).

⁵ Cf. Apollon. Rh. ii. 745 εἰς ἄλα . . . ἠώην viz. Pontus.

⁶ A.P. ix. 668. 2; x. 4, 102. 6; xii. 171. 2.

in Callimachus' *Lock of Berenice* he is intimately connected with the new Aphrodite, the divine Arsinoë.¹ All that, of course, is no basis for any plausible reconstruction; but there is, as far as I can see, nothing inconsistent with an epicedium of the Bithynian poet in col. i and ii. About the other part of the double leaf, containing the remains of two further still more mutilated columns, nothing can be said at all. Not only do we not know the order of the two 'conjugate' leaves (as Mr. Lobel emphasized), but we cannot say whether the two leaves were consecutive or not: a codex usually is composed of gatherings of a number of various sheets and one or more sheets may have intervened, with four columns each, between the two leaves preserved. So it is by no means certain that the few words and scholia legible on the so-called cols. iii and iv of the Geneva fragment belong to the same poem. The words themselves are quite non-committal.

Parthenios as a poet was in the line from Callimachus in respect of language and metrical technique; that could be inferred even from the few old fragments.² So the fact that a work of his hand was taken for a Callimachean piece is understandable, especially when so little is preserved as in this case. The confusion is not a dishonourable one for Parthenios. The accumulation of shortened diphthongs before vowels (i. 3, 4, 6) and the sequence of punctuation after the first dactyl in three lines (i. 4, 5, 6) would have been a little strange in Callimachus' elegiacs; the spondaic hexameter (ii. 11) would have been no obstacle, although it is very rare in his elegiacs, but a spondaic hexameter may be expected to turn up in the poem of a νεώτερος, even within a few lines. To sum up: there seems to be no objection to Parthenios as the writer of this poem. The combination of Arete and Nicaea is very strong internal evidence in his favour.

But there remains one difficulty. Even Wilamowitz had approved of one argument put forward in favour of Callimachus, namely that elegiacs with scholia in a late codex could hardly be anything else but the *Aitia*. I now think we should not be too much surprised if, for instance, Antimachos' *Lyde* were found with scholia.³ But Parthenios? There is no doubt about his enormous reputation in his own lifetime, in the circle of the neoterics as well as in that of Augustan poets. Moreover, Tiberius was especially fond of his works and Hadrian renewed his memory; later on, Gregorius Nazianzenus and Nonnus read his poems.⁴ But for some years past we actually have got evidence that Parthenios' elegiacs had been commented on. An elegiac fragment, published in *Catalogue of Literary Papyri in the British Museum*, nr. 64 by Mr. H. J. M. Milne, 1927, could be identified as a piece of Parthenios by W. Croenert, who assisted the editor:⁵ one of the marginal notes explains the word *δροίτη*, used in the text of the elegy, as *κορός*, and the Et. gen. s.v. *δροίτη* quotes Parthenios as using it just in this sense (fr. 44 Mart.).⁶ The description of the manu-

¹ Cf. *Philol.* lxxxvii (1932), pp. 194 ff.

² The only exception is the supplement by the last editor of fr. 31. 2.

³ The commentary to Antimachos, found a few years ago (*Papiri d. R. Università di Milano*, ed. A. Vogliano, vol. i, 1937, no. 17), apparently belongs to one of his epic poems; but there is no reason why the *Lyde* should not have been treated in the same way.

⁴ Martini to fr. 22 (but cf. Wilamowitz, *Sitzb. Ber. Preuss. Akad.*, 1914, p. 242. 2).

⁵ Cf. A. D. Knox, *JEA* xv, 1929, p. 140; only brief references by A. Körte, *APF* x. 41; J. U. Powell, *New Chapters*, iii. 186.

⁶ Et. gen. v. *δροίτη* ἡ πύλος . . . Παρθένιος δὲ

τὴν κορόν (B, *σωρόν* A) καὶ Αἰσχύλος. All editors of Parthenios refer by mistake to Aesch. *Ag.* 1540; but here and in *Eum.* 633 (however corrupt the passage as a whole may be) *δροίτη* means 'bathing-tub', as later in Lyc. 1108 and Nic. *Al.* 462. The Etym. obviously refers to Aesch. *Cho.* 999 *δροίτης κατακρήνωμα*, with the marginal note *παραπέτασμα κοροῦ* (Stanley, *δρου* cod.); cf. *Schol. Eum.* 633 and Eust., p. 1726. 14. Only here and in Parthenios is *δροίτη* the 'coffin' (not the 'bier' as GEL⁹ gives for Parthenios, registering *Cho.* 999 by a further mistake under 'bathing-tub', see Tucker's note to Aesch. *Cho.* 997). Cf. E. Schwyzler, *KZ* lxii (1935), p. 200.

script given by Mr. Milne is this: The fragment was acquired in 1893 (it did not originate from a British excavation; Inv. No. Add. MS. 34473, art. 4); it is from the top of a vellum leaf, there are remains of 16 lines on each side; the writing of the text is a small uncial hand, of which the date, as Mr. Milne puts it, may be the third or fourth century A.D.; as far as the margin is preserved, there are marginal notes very hard to read in a cursive hand. This sounds exactly like a description of our Geneva fragment: acquired in Egypt a little later; coming from the top of a double vellum leaf with 16 lines, that means it has the same height, but nearly double the breadth (exactly 9 to 5); the text is written in a small uncial hand; cursive notes on the margin, considerably more, since it is broader and more margin has been preserved. The only difference in the descriptions, as far as they are given by the first editors, lies in the dating of the uncial hand. Nicole was inclined to ascribe it to the fifth or even sixth century A.D.;¹ with this hardly anybody would agree to-day, comparing our much richer material. But it will always be a hazardous task to date literary papyri, and especially to date such an early parchment uncial. I should think that the fourth century is not unlikely. It would be too much to assume that all the points of coincidence are fortuitous, and it can be reasonably inferred that the Geneva fragment and the London fragment are parts of the same codex. Unfortunately, the British Museum fragment itself is inaccessible at the moment, and no photograph is available.² So the external evidence in the strict sense of the word remains out of reach for the time being.

There is also no opportunity of dealing with any particulars of the London text, for the same reason. The elegiac lines are certainly part of a 'lament', but not of the epicedium for Arete. A male person, perhaps one Timander who is addressed, had met with early death, far from his home, and was cremated in a foreign country. It may be worth noting that there are relatively many shortened diphthongs at the end of words before vowels (2, 6, 11, 17). Among the old fragments of Parthenios there is one further elegiac lament attested, for a woman called Archelais (fr. 2 Mart.). A pentameter, quoted from a poem for a man called Bias, is also very likely from a lament, as the funeral pile is mentioned which occurs so often in Roman laments (fr. 4 Mart.). Finally, there is quoted an epicedium for *Αὔξιθεμις*, of which the metrical form is unknown (fr. 13 Mart.). If we are right in deriving the two vellum leaves from the same codex of the fourth (or fifth) century, the codex contained that genre of poems which Parthenios especially cultivated.

Two brief historical remarks may be added to these statements about text and manuscripts. Suid. s.v. *Παρθένιος* quotes from Hermippos of Berytos' book *περί τῶν ἐν παιδείᾳ διαλαμπάντων δούλων*: 'οὗτος ἐλήφθη ὑπὸ Κίνα λάφυρον, ὅτε Μιθριδάτην Ῥωμαῖοι κατεπολέμησαν' εἴτα ἀφείθη διὰ τὴν παιδεύειν.' Most people assume that he was made prisoner when Nicaea was occupied in 72 B.C.; but it is by no means certain that he was in his native city just at that moment. Since the war waged by the Romans against Mithridates lasted until 65, and we do not know what Cinna took the poet Parthenios as booty, he may have been in Bithynia until 65. If he was released because of his *παιδεύειν*, of his pre-eminence in literature and learning, he seems to

¹ The writing is so unequal that Nicole believed col. ii on the verso to have been written by a hand different from that which wrote col. i; in the scholia he tried to distinguish no less than ten different writings from uncial to cursive. Indeed, it is a rather strange mixture, and I cannot refer to any similar vellum leaf reproduced on facsimile. The parchment fragment of Euphorion, *Berl. Klass. Texte*, v. 1,

p. 59, is supposed to have been written in the fifth century; in the same volume, p. 89, an elegiac epicedium is published, probably fourth century.

² Both Dr. H. I. Bell and Mr. Milne agree that the conjecture about the provenance of the two pieces from the same codex is highly probable.

have
geogr
so we
befor
comp
his p
but t
late
alrea
to inf
of the
as th
Bithy
Cinna
of the

Th
Every
to a
the li
eight
prehe
Antin
poem
grief.
plied
and lo
perha
of Ioc
autho
ἐπικη
an ep

¹ De
cussed
Nicaea,
d. R. 4
(1933),
pp. 497
the K
the po
convinc

² C.
fr. 1 Ma
men de
c. 96 an
Morel (C
elegiac
Morel,
laments
and esp
to Par
either
Gallus:
stories,
Hermes
test. 3

have made his reputation before that time. Now, in the Geneva fragment the whole geographical background is Bithynian, and the poet is speaking in the present tense: so we may conclude that the epicedion for Arete had been written before 65 (possibly before 72), the year in which he was transferred to Italy. Of course, we cannot completely exclude the possibility that he had to leave his wife in Nicaea and wrote his poem when in Italy he heard of her death, or that she accompanied him to Italy; but there is nothing in the text or scholia which would suggest it. Even if we take the latest possible date for his arrival in the west with poems like the elegiac epicedium already completed and published, this date would be early enough to have enabled him to influence the circle of the *poetae novi* from the very beginning of their career; none of them seems to have started before 65.¹ It is of some importance to note this fact, as there has until now been no evidence for Parthenios' early production while in Bithynia. His influence, then, extended over the time of Licinius Calvus, Helvius Cinna, Catullus to Cornelius Gallus and the Augustan age; he actually became one of the important mediators between East and West.²

The remains of the epicedium, small as they are, may give us a further clue. Everything which we are able to read points to a poem of a personal character, not to a narrative mythical one. Therefore Parthenios' *Arete* was evidently not in the line of Antimachos' *Lyde*;³ the nine quotations from Antimachos' poem, and eight more which are reasonably attributed to it, clearly show that it comprehended a long series of extensive mythical tales. Plutarch attests⁴ that Antimachos, after the death of his beloved wife Lyde, wrote this great elegiac poem about the misfortunes of the heroes in order to comfort himself in his grief. But it has never been called an *ἐπικήδειον*. This term⁵ seems to have been applied only to shorter mournful poems in hexameters or elegiacs, expressing grief and love and praise and consolation. The evidence is scanty: in the early fifth century perhaps Archelaos ὁ φρυκικός wrote an elegiac poem to comfort Kimon after the death of Iodike (*Vorsokr.* 60 B 1, Diels-Kr. ii⁵, p. 48).⁶ Euripides was supposed to be the author of an epigram in the late fifth century for the Athenian heroes in Sicily, called *ἐπικήδειον* by Plutarch;⁷ the date of the anonymous writer of an *ἐπικήδειον* for Pindar, an epigram like the Euripidean one of one pair of verse lines only, cannot be fixed.⁸

¹ Details of chronology were recently discussed at length by A. Rostagni, 'Partenio di Nicaea, Elvio Cinna ed i "poetae novi"', *Atti d. R. Accad. delle scienze di Torino*, vol. lxxxvi (1933), Tom. 2, 'cl. di sc. morali, stor. e fil.', pp. 497-545. He especially tries to prove that the *Kinnas* who took Parthenios as booty was the poet; but his arguments are not at all convincing.

² C. Licinius Calvus: see F. Marx ad Parth. fr. 1 Mart.; we have no quotation from his 'carmen de morte Quintiliae uxoris' to which Catull. c. 96 and Prop. ii. 34. 90 refer, but fr. 15 and 16 Morel (*FPL* 1927, p. 86) apparently belong to an elegiac epicedium. C. Helvius Cinna: see fr. 1 Morel, p. 87, and Parth. fr. 21 Mart. Catullus' laments for his brother, who died in Bithynia, and especially c. 68, may have been indebted to Parthenios or not; there is no possibility either of proving or denying it. Cornelius Gallus: see the dedicatory letter to the love stories, p. 42 Mart., and F. Zimmermann, *Hermes*, lxi, 1934, pp. 179 ff. Virgil (?): Parth. test. 3 Mart.

³ *Antimach. Coloph. reliqu.*, ed. B. Wyss, 1936, fr. 56 ff. Formerly, I was rather inclined to take the opposite view with F. Jacoby, *Rh. M.* lx, 1905, pp. 47. 66.

⁴ [Plut.] *Cons. ad. Ap.* 9, p. 106 B, test. 7, p. lxxv Wyss.

⁵ Greek grammarians were only interested to draw a line between *ἐπικήδειον* and *θρήνος*, H. Faerber, *Die Lyrik i. d. Kunsttheorie der Antike*, München, 1936, texts, pp. 53 ff. Cf. O. Crusius, 'Epikedeion', *R-E*, vi. 113; R. Reitzenstein, 'Epigramm', *R-E*, vi. 100; P. Maas, 'Threnos', *R-E*, vi A., p. 596 f.; G. Pasquali, *Orazio lirico*, Firenze, 1920, pp. 241 ff.

⁶ *ταῖς γεγραμμέναις ἐπὶ παρηγορίᾳ τοῦ πένθους ἐλεγείαις*: cf. *PLG* ii⁴, p. 259 Bergk.; but Plutarch does not use the term 'epicedium'.

⁷ *Plut. Nic.* 17 = F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *Histor. griech. Epigramme*, Bonn, 1926, No. 55.

⁸ *Plut. de an. procr.* 33, p. 1030 A = A.P. vii. 35. Plutarch calls also an epigram on Spartan heroes, written before the time of Teles and repeatedly quoted (see Preger, *Inscr. Gr. metr.*, nr. 3), *ἐπικήδειον*, *Pelopid.* 1.

In the middle of the fourth century Erinna composed a hexametric lament for her girl friend Baukis.¹ In some lists of his works *ἐπικήδεια* were attributed to Theokritos;² better attested are three epicedia of Aratos and one of Euphorion for male persons, relatives, or friends.³ Parthenios' *Arete* is likely to have been in the line of descent from poems of this kind of the fifth, fourth, and third century. The particular character of Parthenios' elegy consists in the fact that the poet himself revealed his own sentiments in this larger poetical form, not compressing them into a few distichs. At least one couple of mythical figures, Iris and her husband Zephyrus, were connected with these personal utterances. We also possess Parthenios' collection of short mythical love stories, which he dedicated to his friend Cornelius Gallus for him to introduce them into his epic and elegiac poems as appropriate examples.⁴ As far as we are able to understand the Geneva fragment, we hear of the poet's feelings of deep distress. *Κύπριν* i. 16 is only a supplement, pointing to the erotic sphere; but what he possibly said about his love (if he said anything at all) we simply cannot guess. Licinius Calvus' lament for his wife Quintilia, already quoted, may have been akin to Parthenios' *Arete*, even some sort of imitation. The great cycles of elegiac poems of the Augustan poets still appear to be a new Roman creation: each poet addressed a beloved woman, telling in detail his erotic desires, experiences, recollections. Parthenios' *Arete*-poem can hardly be excluded from the development leading to this novel Roman elegiac poetry. It may even have been a not unimportant link. That seems to be the natural inference to draw from the Geneva fragment.

Whatever may be thought of such attempts at historical reconstruction, and even if one should call in question the new attribution, two gains are beyond question. First, the revision of the fragment has provided once more an instructive example of the fallacy of arguments (but we cannot help taking similar risks every day); and secondly, it is a relief not to be obliged to include this irritating piece in any new edition of Callimachus.

CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, OXFORD.

R. PFEIFFER.

¹ PSI ix. 1090; cf. P. Maas, *Hermes*, lxix, 1934, pp. 206 ff.

² Suid. s.v. Θεόκριτος . . . τινὲς δὲ ἀναφέρουσιν εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ ταῦτα . . . ἐπικήδεια, μέλη, ἐλεγείας καὶ ἰάμβους, ἐπιγράμματα (cf. Wilamowitz, *Textgeschichte d. Bukoliker*, p. 128 f.). The editors of Suid. are hardly right in reading ἐπικήδεια μέλη; μέλη refers to lyric poems in general as another section of Theokritos' works, see e.g. Suid. article on Callimachus.

³ Arat. *Vit.* i, p. 55 Westerm. = E. Maass, *Comment. in Arat.*, p. 78, 34 εἰς Μύριν τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἐπικήδειον. Schol. A Σ 486 "Αρατος ἐν τῷ πρὸς Θεόπροπον ἐπικήδειῳ cf. *Comm. in Arat.*, pp. 229, 389. Suid. v. "Αρατος . . . εἰς Θεόπροπον . . . ἐπικήδειον ἴτον Κλεομβρότου cf. E. Maass, *Aratea*, 1892, p. 233 de Ar. scriptis deperditis. Diog.

L. ix. 8. 9 Πρωταγόρας ἀστρολόγος, εἰς ὃν καὶ Εὐφορίων ἐπικήδειον ἔγραψε: written in hexameters, if fr. 21 Powell comes from this poem. Among the 'Hesiodic' apocrypha (Suid. v. 'Hesiodos = Hesiod. *Carm.* i, p. 114 Jacoby, test. 11): ἐπικήδειον εἰς Βάτραχόν τινα ἐρώμενον αὐτοῦ. There is not the slightest probability either that Philotas' Telephos (fr. 15 Pow., p. 93) was an epicedium for his father, or that Callim. fr. 363 Schn. belonged to an epicedium for a youth (against G. Pasquali, *Orazio lir.*, p. 259. 3).

⁴ This seems to be the meaning of the sentence: αὐτῷ τέ κοὶ παρέσται εἰς ἔπη καὶ ἐλεγείας ἀνάγειν τὰ μάλιστα ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀρμόδια, Parthen., p. 43. 8 Mart.

O.T. 114

ON οὐδ' followed [had see ἄγγελος Hdt. iv. examine

Our rememb or corrup our κατε with the a revers there ha natural have ha whether

It is, cised ab rough as fits συμ must hav here; ye κατεῖπ'.³ extraord Ibid. 702

Read recital'; sensible καλῶ γ' ἰ Preci When in neither v ὥδ' ἔχων the Phil

¹ Jebb tell?' The

² With Bruhn.

4599-8

FIVE PASSAGES IN SOPHOCLES

O.T. 114-19

- KP. θεωρός, ὡς ἔφασκεν, ἐκδημῶν πάλιν
 πρὸς οἶκον οὐκέθ' ἵκεθ', ὡς ἀπεστάλη.
 OI. οὐδ' ἄγγελός τις οὐδὲ συμπράκτωρ ὁδοῦ
 κατεῖδ', ὅτου τις ἐκμαθὼν ἐχρήσατ' ἄν;
 KP. θνήσκουσι γάρ, πλὴν εἰς τις, ὅς φόβῳ φυγῶν
 ὦν εἶδε πλὴν ἐν οὐδὲν εἶχ' εἰδὼς φράσαι.

ON οὐδ' ἄγγελός τις κτλ. Jebb writes: 'The sentence begins as if ἄγγελός τις were to be followed by ἦλθε: but the second alternative, συμπράκτωρ ὁδοῦ, suggests κατεῖδε [had seen, though he did not speak]: and this, by a kind of zeugma, stands as verb to ἄγγελός also.' In support he cites only an atrocious zeugma from the MS. text of Hdt. iv. 106; but this has (and had) been corrected, as anyone may now see who will examine the text and apparatus of chs. 106 and 107 as presented in Hude's edition.

Our apparent Sophoclean specimen is in one respect the strangest zeugma I can remember to have encountered. In all known examples, no matter whether genuine or corrupt (and I have a grim collection of these latter), the word corresponding to our κατεῖδε is used properly with the nearer of the two 'yoked' items and improperly with the remoter; as we should of course expect. But here we are confronted with a reverse phenomenon. It would be perfectly natural for Oedipus to inquire whether there had not been 'some' reporter who had *witnessed* the episode; it is wholly unnatural for him to ask such a question about the entourage of Laius, since Laius must have had one and they must have been in the affray. The question of course was whether or not any of them had returned to tell the tale.

It is, in brief, obvious that κατεῖδε is corrupt, and Pearson must have been exercised about it or he would never have admitted to his apparatus an emendation so rough as Ascherson's κατήλθ'; which indeed has the further disadvantage that it only fits συμπράκτωρ, since there is no ground whatever for assuming that the ἄγγελός must have been an Athenian. This² appears to have been the only proposal ever made here; yet it seems almost incredible that nobody should hitherto have restored κατεῖπ'.³ For that matter, however, my next item is to my thinking hardly less extraordinary.

Ibid. 702

IO. λέγ', εἰ σαφῶς τὸ νείκος ἐγκαλῶν ἐρεῖς.

Read ἐν καλῷ γ' ἐρεῖς, 'provided at least that this is a time and place for a full recital'; i.e. unless you would rather tell me when we are alone. On the part of the sensible Jocasta this is a wise and helpful precaution; on the part of Sophocles ἐν καλῷ γ' is a characteristically 'ironic' touch.

Precisely this same corruption occurs, in my opinion, elsewhere in Sophocles. When in pursuance of Jebb's note I turn to *Phil.* 328 I find in my own working text neither what he gives nor what Pearson writes, but this: εἰ γ', ὦ τέκνον· τίνος δ' ἄρ' ὦδ' ἔχων μέγαν | χόλον κατ' αὐτῶν ἐν καλῷ πελήλυθας; How anybody who had read the *Philoctetes* could reject Tournier's ἐν καλῷ πελ. here I cannot imagine. It was

¹ Jebb mistranslates 'And was there none to tell?' The Greek for that is οὐδ' ἄγγελός τις οὐδεὶς...

² With its variant κατήλθεν οἱ, Schwartz, rec.

Bruhn.

4599.8

³ κατεῖπ' may very well have owed its corruption largely to εἶδε in the reply; what answers to it is of course not that but φράσαι.

because I had incorporated¹ that and Erfurdt's earlier and basic ὡδ' ἔχων that I was able some years ago to add to these my own δ' ἄρ' for γάρ and thus obtain perfect sense. 'Splendid, my lad! but, now, just why . . . ?'² Yet Pearson ignoring Tournier altogether must insert his hopeless ἐκκαλῶν, and Lawson, *C.R.* xliii. 6, go one worse with ἐγκοτῶν.

Sound restoration is impossible except upon a basis of sound restoration.

Instances of ἐν καλῶ are given in *L.S.J.*, s.v. καλός II. 1, but I am not altogether happy about their strict classification by 'time' and 'place'; 'circumstances' is surely the implication of the phrase.

Ibid. 706

τό γ' εἰς ἐαυτὸν πᾶν ἐλευθεροῖ στόμα.

Jebb's note is one thing, his translation quite another; and neither fits the facts. Pearson is much more cautious: 'verba nondum satis expedita.' I read πᾶν ἐν εὐχερεῖ στόμα. Creon had been cool, rational, persuasive, gentle; his behaviour throughout the scene was exemplary. The distracted and angry Oedipus now complains to Jocasta that Creon had 'made light of the whole matter', that he had been 'wholly unconcerned'. The idiom ἐν εὐχερεῖ (or other adjective) = εὐχερής is adequately expounded in the obvious authorities and in many other places; for a clear and instructive example see *O.C.* 586 with Jebb's note. For the sense cf. e.g. εὐχερῶς φέρειν *Plat. Rep.* 474 e, λέγειν *id. Theat.* 154 b. The adjective in much the same sense occurs at *Phil.* 519; and ἐν εὐχερεῖ, in precisely this sense, will be found *ibid.* 875; that surely settles it. εὐχερής is an interesting word, and common.

O.C. 1416-23

AN. στρέψαι στρατεύμ' ἐς Ἄργος ὡς τάχιστα γε,
καὶ μὴ σέ τ' αὐτὸν καὶ πόλιν διεργάσῃ.

ΠΟ. ἀλλ' οὐχ οἷόν τε. πῶς γὰρ αὖθις ἂν πάλιν
στράτευμ' ἄγοιμι ταυτὸν εἰσάπαξ τρέσας;

AN. τί δ' αὖθις, ὦ παῖ, δεῖ σε θυμοῦσθαι; τί σοι
πάτρην κατασκάψαντι κέρδος ἔρχεται;

ΠΟ. αἰσχρὸν τὸ φεύγειν, καὶ τὸ πρεσβεύοντ' ἐμὲ
οὕτω γελᾶσθαι τοῦ κασιγνήτου πάρα.

1418 ἂν Vauvilliers; recte recipitur: αὖ codd.

The dialogue between brother and sister from which these lines are taken is one of the noblest, most human, and most tragic in Sophocles; but at one crucial point these lines are ruined by a corruption as subtle and insidious as could well have established itself anywhere. They have also, in my opinion, two minor and, by comparison, almost harmless corruptions.

That αὖθις in 1420, says Jebb, is 'an echo' of the αὖθις of two lines above. Whether as rhetoric or as logic, such repetition would be perfectly in point; and the word is in the right position, namely the emphatic. For all that, it is wrong; it is impossible; it has every virtue but one, it does not make sense.

The dialogue is as fine and stark in expression as is the situation in conception; the sense of character is profound. Oedipus hates his son; Antigone loves her father most, but she also, and deeply, loves her brother; cold and indifferent from first to last in his attitude to his father, Polyneices returns his sister's affection. Yet mutual love itself cannot overcome the difference in outlook and action between the woman whom Sophocles elsewhere represented as saying οὗτοι συνέχθειν ἀλλὰ συμφιλεῖν ἔφυν and this

¹ Strictly, I deduced ἐν κ. π. myself from Erfurdt's change, and then found that I had been anticipated by Tournier.

² For ἄρα with interrogatives, cf. Denniston,

Particles, pp. 39 f. δ' ἄρα is very common in Greek with the sense of δέ plus the sense of ἄρα.

proud and headstrong prince, whose hatred of his own younger brother weighs more with him than does any love of his native city. The inevitability of the impending disaster is itself not more poignant than is this vision of the unbridgeable gulf between sister and brother, and therewith of the mutual affection which, although it can never heal that breach, can never be impaired because of it.

For although they do not share one another's convictions, these two, they understand one another's language; they are both aristocrats. When Polyneices asked 'How, if I had once played the coward, could I ever lead my army again?' Antigone never answered 'But why *need* you ever lead your army again?' Neither did she suggest that if she could once prevail on him to *spare* his native city, the only expedition he could ever thereafter think of leading would be one which would not only in itself *belie* that promise, but the assumption of which in this answer at once completely stultifies the entire dialogue between herself and him from 1414 up to this point, 1421; and incidentally also beyond, because it subsumes 1422 f. along with 1420 f. as dependent on the hypothesis *εἰσάπαξ τρέσας*, which hypothesis *has never been cancelled*.

Where we have *αἰθῆς* in 1420, Sophocles wrote *αὐτίκ' αὐτίκα* ('forthwith'—L.S.J.) here means 'in the immediate future' as opposed to the remoter future of *αἰθῆς*; just as, in opposition to *οὐ πω*, it has already been applied to this very same event some lines above, at 1371; and had previously been applied to the same event in 380. The citations in L.S.J. s.v. I. 2 are very relevant; none more so than 'Th. opposes τὸ αὐ. and ὁ μέλλον πόλεμος 1. 36, cf. 2. 41'.

One result of this change is that *θυμοδοθαι* is no longer the equivalent of *στράτευμ' ἄγοιμι* (an equivalence which long ago struck me as odd¹), but antithetical to *τρέσας*. What answers to *στρ. ἄγ.* is now *πάτραν κατασκάψαντι*; as it should be. And surely Antigone's reply is now like the rest of this dialogue, profoundly in character.

In 1419 *ταῦτόν*, although far less pernicious, is in my judgement equally insidious. How logical it looks! how easy to persuade oneself that it will do! Even so, it has been emended by four acute critics; and above all do I admire Wecklein's heroic *ἀγέιρομι' ἀλλ' ἄν* in exactly contrary sense—stark and rational, such a thing as the Athenian might well have written but patently did not. To what writer with the blank space in front of him would it have occurred to limit the young prince's military future specifically to leadership of 'the same' army?—however some Jebb might eventually gloze this not very accurate² description. *ταῦτόν* has overlaid an epithet antithetical to *τρέσας*. I think that *TAYTON* came from *TAMON*, and I would read *στράτευμ' ἄγοιμι' (ἄν) ἱταμόν εἰσάπαξ τρέσας*.³ *ἱταμός* (render here 'valiant') means full of 'dash', and is a very good prose word that was lyrical for Aeschylus; the extremes cover the mean. Blaydes acutely pointed out that *εἰσάπαξ* means 'once for all', whereas the sense required (with *ταῦτόν*, which in 1859 he accepted) is not that but 'once'; he therefore proposed three ways⁴ of reading *ἅπαξ*. No, 'once for all' is the sense intended, and mine is the only reading that will justify it. Polyneices is

¹ It is so odd, that Hermann and Blaydes were both driven to supposing that it must mean 'But why again be thus angry (at what I suggest)?' (Hermann *coll. Eur. El.* 1120).

² Truth to tell, the 'Seven against Thebes' was *ex hypothesi* an *ad hoc* muster, such as would never have reassembled, and least of all for a different purpose; but once more that mischievous *αἰθῆς* in 1420 (reinforced probably—for many—by the false *αἶν* in 1418, on which see below) has made everybody think of P. as

attacking *Thebes* again after abandoning the expedition, although this is sheer nonsense.

³ I would not read *αὐτός*, with *τρέσας*, as that would not account for our tradition. I thought of *τοῦμόν* (which was proposed by Blaydes forty years after his edition, *Adv. Crit. in Soph.* p. 135), but dismissed it as too emphatic.

⁴ But not, oddly enough, the best and simplest, *εἰς ἅπαξ τρέσας*; which I therefore here offer to those who will not have *ἱταμόν*.

concerned, not (as would seem to have been generally assumed) with his morale, but with his reputation, his prestige. And this, I again feel, is profoundly in character; cf. e.g. 1422 f. He himself of course knows perfectly well that yielding to his sister's 'supplication' would be one thing, playing the coward another. Indeed, I would go so far as to punctuate εἰσάπαξ "τρέσας", because only so does the speaker's real meaning emerge.

We must not upon any account allow ἀγομ' ἄν to disturb the correction ἄν for αὖ in the earlier part of the same sentence. Editors note, indeed, that αὖθις αὖ πάλιν recurs at *Phil.* 952, but they do not seem to observe that that is in a different sense. αὖθις πάλιν by a common Greek pleonasm means 'again', but *three* agains really do mean 'back again'. My own double ἄν is, of course, extremely common alike in verse and prose.

At the end of 1416, and with ὡς τάχιστα, γε could hardly have been sound, even if there were not other difficulties; the particle has no conceivable function. And this is in fact the only difficulty that had yet been generally observed. Pearson admits to his apparatus τάχιστά σε, which is one of three conjectures offered with characteristic volatility by Blaydes (and Meineke made it four years later); but after that σε in 1414 we are obviously much better without one here.¹ Badham² had anticipated Blaydes' alternative suggestion ὡς τάχιστ', ἄγε; but this is surely too exclamatory and intimate for so large and serious a request; moreover there would seem to be no parallel for such transference of ἄγε from the beginning of an exhortation to its end. In any case, however, the line has other flaws. (ii) That P. should give to his army the command 'about turn' is not a complete statement of the sisterly appeal; (iii) the middle is odd here, especially as we have had the active in precisely the same sense just above, 1403; and this point, for one, had been glanced at by Blaydes, who suggested—unmethodically—στρέψον; (iv) στρέψαι here does in fact seem to be the sole example cited of the aorist middle of the simple verb.

All four abnormalities can be removed by the alteration of a single letter: στρέψα(ς) στράτευμ' ἐς Ἄργος ὡς τάχιστ' ἄγε. For ἄγε as an ordinary imperative see *Ai.* 542.

And even now, this correction can be confirmed. Polyneices repeats her phrase. 'Lead your army back to Argos.' 'If I did, how could I ever lead an army again?—a valiant army, I "a coward".' Such is Greek balance.

¹ Actually, σε is impossible; it turns στρέψαι into infin. act., whereas the syntax of 1417 proves 1416 to have been imperative.

² This I infer from Jebb, although he omits

the comma; I have not yet run Badham's note to earth, but I find no record of any change of στρέψαι other than Blaydes'.

A. Y. CAMPBELL.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL.

CRITICISM OF INDIVIDUALS IN ROMAN POPULAR COMEDY¹

IN the Old Attic Comedy contemporary figures were criticized in the most outspoken manner. The legitimate stage seems to have departed from this practice in part with the advent of the Middle Comedy, and almost completely in the New.² It might be tempting to imagine that direct criticism of contemporaries could still have been found on the impermanent stages of the travelling mimes. But there is no evidence to show that this was so. From the beginning the Greek mime laid the emphasis on the portrayal of character, on the delineation of types rather than of individuals. In the information that we possess about the *deikelistai* and other forms of immature burlesque, about the comedy of Megara, and about the *phlyakes* of Tarentum, there is nothing to show that the little plays took any cognizance of contemporary events; the only individualized characters introduced are the gods and heroes of mythology. The fragments of Sophron and Epicharmus give no indication that they attacked men of their own times, while the extant mimes of Herodas, like the mimic imitations in Theocritus, are concerned solely with types of humanity, not with individuals.

The only suggestion that the Greek mime may have possessed a vein of personal criticism comes from the story³ that, on the suggestion of the tyrant Dionysius, Sophron's son Xenarchus used to ridicule the cowardice of the people of Rhegium. Nymphodorus ὁ θαυματοποιός⁴ had done this before him. Even here it is the class of Rhegine cowards, and not individuals, that come under the lash. Demosthenes,⁵ indeed, says of Philip: *μίμους γελοίων καὶ ποιητὰς αἰσχροῦν ἁσμάτων, ὧν εἰς τοὺς συνόντας ποιοῦσιν ἔνεκα τοῦ γελασθῆναι, τοὺτους ἀγαπᾷ καὶ περὶ αὐτὸν ἔχει*. But these mimes and cheap poets seem to have been somewhat in the position of the medieval Court Fool. Their purpose was to amuse the company at banquets and similar gatherings; there is nothing in this passage to imply that it was part of the mimic actor's business to indulge in topical caricatures on the stage. In the same way, there is no need to read any theatrical allusion into the comment of the scholiast on this passage:⁶ *εἰκὸς γὰρ τοὺς μίμους καὶ εἰς τοὺς κρείττους ἀποσκώπτειν*. If the scholiast was thinking of the theatre when he wrote these words, it was the theatre of his own day, when the outlook of the mime had changed.

The *palliatae* of Plautus and Terence and their contemporaries and successors, modelled as they were on the New Comedy of Athens, did not admit criticisms of living personages. (The attacks on Luscius Lanuvinus in the prologues of Terence are on a different plane.) Names like Quintus, Sextus, Paula, and so on are found in the fragmentary remains of the *fabula togata*;⁷ but, so far as may be discerned from

¹ A number of examples of personal criticism in Roman mime-plays or by Roman mime-actors were collected by Hermann Reich (*Der Mimus*, Berlin, 1903, pp. 186 ff.), but his method of presentation was haphazard in the extreme. In this article an attempt is made to treat the subject comprehensively and in a more orderly manner. I should like to express my gratitude to Professor M. J. Boyd of Belfast for his acute and clarifying comments on some of the passages quoted in this article.

² Christ-Schmid, *Geschichte der griechischen Litt.*, vol. i (1912), p. 440 and vol. ii (1920), p. 33.

What little personal criticism there was occurred incidentally and in the prologues.

³ Recorded by Suidas and Photius s.v. *Ῥηγινοὺς*; the verb used is *ἐκωμῶδει*, but Xenarchus is known as a mimographer from Arist. *Poet.* 2.

⁴ Athen. 19 F. It is believed that *μίμοι* originally emerged from the wider class of *θαυματοποιοί*; cf. Reich, l.c., pp. 320, 511-23; Allardyce Nicoll, *Masks, Mimes and Miracles* (Harrap 1931), p. 35.

⁵ 23. 32 = *Ol.* 2. 19.

⁶ Demosthenes, ed. Dindorf, vol. viii, p. 100.

⁷ Titinius, 104, 107, 109, 179 Ribb.; Afranius, 3, 20, 95, 211, 272 Ribb.

the brief sentences in which they occur, they are in no way allusive to prominent individuals of the day.¹

Cicero, indeed, is reported as writing² that the ancient Romans would not allow any living man to be mentioned on the stage, whether with praise or blame. Yet it was little more than a century after Livius Andronicus' first play was seen at Rome that criticism of contemporary figures does appear on the stage, the stage of the mimes. At some time in the late second century B.C. the poets Accius and Lucilius were attacked by name on the stage and prosecuted their derogators.³ We have no knowledge whether the criticism to which exception was taken was on a literary or a personal plane; the subsequent prosecutions suggest the latter. At any rate, the Law took a different view of the two cases. The attacker of Lucilius—he is not expressly stated to have been a mime, but it is very likely that he was—was acquitted. The mime who lampooned Accius came before a different judge. His defence was that he had a perfect right to name on the stage a man who himself wrote for the stage; the inference was that Accius, if he cared to write a mime, could easily obtain his revenge. But he was condemned.

The mime was brought into the realm of Latin literature by the *equus* Decimus Laberius, of whose pieces over 150 fragmentary lines remain. As far as can be judged from these, his style owed much to the *fabula togata*, but, unlike the authors of plays of that category, he did indulge freely in topical personalities. Some of his allusions may have been covert. When Cicero wants to persuade his friend, the lawyer C. Trebatius Testa, not to accompany Caesar any further in his Gallic campaign, but to return to Rome, he threatens him playfully with the prospect of being gayed by Laberius. 'What a character for the stage—a British lawyer!'⁴

But there was nothing covert about the attacks which Laberius made upon Caesar himself. In 46 B.C. the dictator invited him to take part in his games and himself appear on the stage in one of his own mimes. Despite the degradation involved⁵ the old knight did not dare to refuse; but in a prologue⁶ he made it clear that he did so under duress. In the mime itself he took a more pointed revenge. Dressed as a Syrian slave, he rushed across the stage as though he had just been whipped, and cried out the famous lines:

Porro, Quirites! libertatem perdimus.

and

Necesse est multos timeat, quem multi timent.

¹ In 57 B.C. a performance of the *Simulans* of Afranius was made the basis for a political demonstration, the purpose of which was the promotion of the return of Cicero from exile (*pro Sestio* 118). Suitable passages in the play were emphasized by the actors in such a way as to suggest allusions to the contemporary political scene. For instance, when they reached this sentence (I quote from Ribbeck's version):

'haec, taeterrime, . . .

sunt postprincipia atque exitus malae vitiosae vitae'

the actors all concentrated their gaze on Clodius, who was among the audience. 'Et is, qui antea cantorum convicio contiones celebrare suas solebat, cantorum ipsorum vocibus eiciebatur.' The allusions were not, of course, in any way intentional on the part of Afranius, who was most probably dead before this time. In succeeding chapters of the same speech other instances are mentioned of this practice of inventing topical

aptnesses in plays dealing with a bygone age; Aesopus even tampered with the text in order to pay a compliment to Cicero.

² *Rep.* iv. 10, *ap. Aug. de Civ. Dei* ii. 9: 'veteribus displicuisse Romanis vel laudari quemquam in scaena vivum hominem vel vituperari'.

³ *Auct. ad Herenn.* i. 14. 24 and ii. 13. 19.

⁴ *ad Fam.* 7. 11. 2: 'si diutius frustra afueris . . . Laberium . . . pertimesco; mira enim persona induci potest Britannici iurisconsulti'.

⁵ Actors were liable to *infamia*: *Livy* 7. 2; *Cic. Rep.* 4. 10; *Corn. Nepos praef.* 4-5; *Friedländer*, vol. ii, pp. 111-13; *Boris Warnecke in N. Jahrb.* 1914, pp. 95 ff., and in *Pauly-Wissowa*, s.v. 'Histrion'. W. M. Green, 'The Status of Actors at Rome', in *Class. Phil.* xxviii, 1933, pp. 301-4. Tenney Frank, in *Class. Phil.* xxvi, 1931, pp. 11-20, believes that the stigma was applied only to the lower types of artistes, among whom he includes mimes. ⁶ 98-124, Ribbeck.

With one accord the spectators turned their eyes to Caesar, and watched his rising temper.¹ The shaft had gone home.

Other extant fragments of Laberius, however, show that it was a normal occurrence for him to comment on political matters. 'Sine lingua caput peditarii sententia est'² is a candid description of these senators who, ranking so far down on the list that the presiding magistrate rarely had time to ask their opinions, had in practice the opportunity only of voting on the motions proposed and shaped by others.³ As Caesar for his own purposes raised the number of senators from the usual six hundred to nine hundred,⁴ so the number of *senatores peditarii* must have been greatly increased. Laberius is in all probability voicing the feelings of the people on this piece of political management. If this tantalizing fragment 'Duas uxores? hercle hoc plus negotii est, inquit cocio; sex aediles viderat' has been rightly interpreted by the editors,⁵ the dramatist is here slyly introducing a double allusion, to Caesar's strengthening of what might be called the police force, and to the popular rumour that he intended to introduce polygamy in an effort to increase the population.⁶ In another mime he pillories the state official who 'stripped the provinces and stole monolith columns and tubs from the baths'.⁷

One may imagine that the political allusions of the mimes, and the reactions of the audiences to them, were watched by all politicians, as from them a rough estimate might be obtained of the popular feeling on questions of the day.⁸ Two letters written by Cicero to Atticus⁹ show this clearly. It is only three weeks after Caesar's assassination, and the Republicans are still uncertain how the people are taking it. The first letter begins: 'Duas a te accepi epistulas heri. ex priore theatrum et Publilium cognovi, bona signa consentientis multitudinis. plausus vero L. Cassio datus etiam facetus mihi quidem visus est.'

The second letter ends with these words: 'Tu si quid *πραγματικόν* habebis, scribes; sin minus, populi *ἐπισημασίαν* et mimorum dicta perscribito.' The word *ἐπισημασία* is used elsewhere¹⁰ by Cicero to describe the ovation given to him, after his verbal brush with Clodius, by the people assembled for the games. It has a similar sense here. The demonstration may have been in favour of the Republicans.¹¹ Cicero does not say so directly, but it is difficult to believe that a man of Cicero's temperament would have used, without modification, the phrase *bona signa consentientis multitudinis*, if he were referring to an incident or incidents which revealed popular approval for the supporters of Antony. The orator suspected the sincerity of the applause given to Lucius Cassius, the tyrannicide's brother, because he had formerly

¹ Macr. Sat. 2. 7. 4. ² 88, Ribbeck.

³ *pedibus ire in alienam sententiam*. Festus, s.v. 'Peditarius senatorem' (317 Linds.): 'Qui ita appellatur quia tacitus transeundo ad eum cuius sententiam probat quid sentiat indicat.' For a discussion of these peditarii see Gellius iii. 18 and Tyrrell and Purser, *Correspondence of Cicero*, vol. i, additional note 4.

⁴ Dio Cass. xliii. 47. 2; cf. ibid. 27. 2; Suet. *Div. Iul.* 41. 1.

⁵ Ribbeck 63-4; Merry, *Select Fragments of Roman Poetry*, Oxford 1898, p. 239; the reading at the end of the first line is very uncertain.

⁶ Cf. Suet. *Div. Iul.* 41. 1 and 52. 3.

⁷ 38-9 Ribbeck.

⁸ The verse of Laberius already quoted ('necesse est multos timeat, quem multi timeant') is said by Seneca to have compelled the attention of everyone, 'non aliter . . . quam si missa esset

vox populi adfectus' (*Dial.* iv. 11. 3).

⁹ *ad Att.* xiv. 2 and 3.

¹⁰ *ad Att.* i. 16. 11. Cicero gave his opinion—biased, it may be, by the circumstances under which it occurred—of the genuineness of applause of this type in *pro Sest.* 115: 'Comitorum et contionum significationes sunt nonnunquam vitatae atque corruptae: theatrales gladiatorumque consessus dicuntur omnino solere levitate nonnullorum emptos plausus exiles et raros excitare; ac tamen facile est, cum id fit, quem ad modum et a quibus fiat et quid integra multitudo faciat videre. quid ego nunc dicam, quibus viris aut cui generi civium maxime plaudatur? neminem vestrum fallit.'

¹¹ Such a demonstration occurred at the *ludi Apollinares* held later in the same year, or so Cicero would have us believe (*Att.* xvi. 5. 2; *Phil.* i (15), 36; ii (13), 30). But see Appian, *B.C.* iii. 24.

been a Caesarian,¹ and his recent conversion to the side of the Liberators was too sudden to carry full conviction.

It is quite clear from Cicero's words that the mimographer Publius Syrus had in some way contributed to the general expression of approval. Most probably this was done by the insertion in the mime itself of an *ambiguus iocus* commenting pointedly on the situation, much in the manner of the attacks of Laberius upon Caesar which have already been quoted. Such remarks could have had only a slight connexion with the plot of the piece, and may have been uttered almost extemporarily under the stimulus of the emotions of the audience.

On the other hand, the audience sometimes saw an allusion where none was intended. Suetonius² tells how an innocent remark uttered by a character in a mime was turned by the spectators into a compliment to the emperor Augustus, who was present. 'Cum, spectante eo ludos, pronuntiatum esset in mimo: "O dominum aequum et bonum!" et universi quasi de ipso dictum exsultantes comprobassent, et statim manu vultuque indecoras adulationes repressit et insequenti die gravissimo corripuit edicto.'

The emperor's behaviour in this case was judiciously severe. He had always, remarks his biographer, disliked the sound of the title *dominus*. But Suetonius does not tell us how he dealt with the adverse demonstration arising from another mimic remark.³ 'Prima iuventa variorum dedecorum infamiam subiit. . . . sed et populus quondam universus ludorum die et accepit in contumeliam eius et adsensu maximo conprobavit versum in scaena pronuntiatum de gallo Matris deum tympanizante: "Videsne, ut cinaedus orbem digito temperat?"' In this case the double meaning was certainly intentional. The play on the emasculate priest of Cybele beating his drum, and the imperial cinaedus ruling the world, is too nice to have been an accident.

At the funeral of the emperor Vespasian, Suetonius tells us,⁴ the archimime Favor appeared in the mask of the deceased, 'imitans, ut mos est, facta et dicta vivi'. The dead man's personal habits and idiosyncrasies were taken off, as a general's were at a triumph.⁵ Vespasian had fewer faults than most emperors, but his parsimony was notorious.⁶ So in everybody's hearing Favor inquired the cost of the funeral with its magnificent procession. He was told, ten million sesterces. 'Give me a hundred thousand,' he cried in the person of the dead emperor, 'and you can throw me into the Tiber!'

Apart from this incident, history is silent for most of the first century of our era on the function of the mime as critic of the powerful.⁸ But there are many instances

¹ Caes. B.C. iii. 34 ff. and 55.

² Aug. 53; the story is retold by Orosius, *adv. pag.* vi. 22. 4, who adds: 'dominumque posthac se appellari ne a liberis quidem aut nepotibus suis vel serius vel ioco passus est'.

³ Ibid. 68. The charges of unnatural vice spread about Octavian by his enemies Sextus Pompeius, Marcus Antonius, and others are perhaps without foundation.

⁴ *Vesp.* 19.

⁵ By actors, App. *Pun.* 66. By the general's own soldiers, Suet. *Div. Iul.* 49 and 51; Livy, iv. 20. 2; 53. 11-12; v. 49. 7; vii. 10. 38; x. 30. 6; xxviii. 9. 18; Mart. i. 4. 3-4. *Scaenici artifices* were present at Julius Caesar's funeral, but Suetonius (*Div. Iul.* 84) does not describe their performance.

⁶ e.g. Tac. *Hist.* ii. 5: 'Si avaritia abesset, antiquis ducibus par.'

⁷ In the reign of Tiberius a *scurra* seized the opportunity of a passing funeral to launch an attack on the emperor: 'Scurram, qui praeter-eunte funere clare mortuo mandarar, ut nuntiaret Augusto nondum reddi legata quae plebei reliquisset, adtractum ad se recipere debitum ducique ad supplicium imperavit et patri suo verum referre' (Suet. *Tib.* 57. 2). This *scurra* was most probably some wit who chanced to be watching the procession; but he may have been a mime—v. inf. p. 44, note 3.

⁸ Seneca, *Dial.* xii. 19. 6, calls Alexandria 'loquax et in contumelias praefectorum ingeniosa provincia, in qua etiam qui vitaverunt culpam non effugerunt infamiam'. Alexandria was a great centre of mimic activity, and one may surmise that mimes played their part in contumacious criticism of their governors. Cf. Cicero, *pro Rab. Post.* 12. 35.

of criticism, or even of abuse, of the emperors in another branch of popular comedy, the *fabula Atellana*. Towards the end of his life Cicero had written¹ that the Atellan was being superseded by the mime as an *exodium*, or after-piece. But the Oscan farce was far from dead. In this first century it seems to have developed a vein of outspoken scurrility, unknown, it would seem, to its first literary exponents Pomponius and Novius, which brought it into continual trouble with the imperial court. In A.D. 23 Tiberius was forced to banish all *histriones* from Italy because of the subversive nature of their performances. 'Multa ab iis in publicum seditiose, foeda per domos temptari.'² But the particular type singled out by the emperor for special condemnation was not the mime but *Oscum ludicrum*, the Atellan farce. For this he may have had personal reasons; but the only recorded instance of an open attack in the theatre upon Tiberius comes from the days of his retirement at Capri. Suetonius³ tells how Tiberius pursued a Roman lady, Mallonia, with his disgusting attentions until she killed herself as the only way to escape them. 'Unde mora in Atellanico exodio, proximis ludis assensu maximo excepta, percrebuit: "hircum vetulum capreis naturam ligurrire."' The audience welcomed the remark; the Atellan actor was fulfilling the duty of public prosecutor.

This form of prosecution continued, although sterner measures were taken against it. Caligula had the author of an Atellan burnt to death in the middle of the arena, *ob ambigui ioci versiculum*.⁴ Nero exiled the actor Datus for a reference to the deaths of Claudius and Agrippa—a penalty which is surprisingly moderate, when one remembers the suspicious circumstances surrounding their deaths, and when one reads Suetonius' account of Datus' performance:⁵ 'et Datus Atellanarum histrio in cantico quodam 'Υγλαυε πάτερ, ὕγλαυε μήτηρ ita demonstraverat, ut bibentem natan-temque faceret, exitum scilicet Claudii Agrippinaeque significans, et in novissima clausula "Orcus vobis ducit pedes" senatum gestu notarat. Histrionem . . . Nero nihil amplius quam urbe Italiaque summovit, vel contemptu omnis infamiae vel ne fatendo dolorem irritaret ingenia.'

But the extent to which the opinions of the man in the street were crystallized by actors in farce is perhaps seen most clearly in Suetonius' story of Galba.⁶ His unpopularity, says the biographer, was made quite clear at a theatrical performance, soon after his entry into Rome as emperor. When the Atellan actors struck up a *notissimum canticum* which began 'Venit Onesimus a villa', all the spectators took it up with one voice and sang it through several times, beginning again at this line.⁷ The exact nature of the allusion is unknown. Onesimus (ὄνισμος) may have been an avaricious master; the song was in that case sung by his town slaves regretting his return from his country estate. For Galba's return from Spain had been preceded by a number of legends about his avarice and meanness.⁸ Some think the name should be Dorsennus,⁹ the name of the well-known stock character in the Atellan burlesque. Others¹⁰ prefer to read 'To Simus', though Galba is known to have been hook-nosed.¹¹ But the point of importance is that again the Atellan actor was the mouthpiece of the crowd and the representative of public opinion.

It is certainly peculiar that in every instance recorded from this century of an

¹ *ad Fam.* ix. 16. 7: 46 B.C.

² *Tac. Ann.* iv. 14.

³ *Tib.* 45. The pun defies translation. See also J. C. Tarter, *Tiberius the Tyrant*, Constable, London, 1902, pp. 359 ff.

⁴ *Suet. Cal.* 27.

⁵ *Suet. Nero* 39. 3.

⁶ *Suet. Galba* 13.

⁷ 'Cuncti simul spectatores consentiente voce reliquam partem rettulerunt ac saepius versu repetito egerunt.'

⁸ *Suet. Galba* 12.

⁹ So Lachmann and Ribbeck.

¹⁰ So Reich, p. 190, following the earlier editors.

¹¹ *Suet. Galba* 21. Simus is a rustic in comedy (*Pollux* iv. 19). The name is applied to satyrs in *CIG* 7417, 7459, 7460, &c.; but it is going too far to imagine, as K. O. Müller did (*Hist. of Lit. of Ancient Greece*, London 1840, vol. ii, p. 43 n.), that Simus was now a stock character in the Atellan.

attack being delivered upon an emperor from the stage it took place at a performance, not of a mime, but of a *fabula Atellana*. Yet the mimes had not fled from Italy. As with the Atellan actors, so with them the banishment by Tiberius can have had only a limited duration. Indeed, this was the age of Philistion and Catullus, the two most frequently mentioned mimographs of the Christian era. Is it only due to chance that no critical voice of theirs has been preserved between the time of Augustus and that of Marcus Aurelius? Or is one rather to suppose that, as the mimodrama increased its size and scope during this period, until it became almost like a new type of comedy, so its preoccupation with the topicalities of the day decreased?

There is, certainly, in this century the case of the younger Pliny's friend Helvidius, whom Domitian put to death because he thought he saw a reference in his play, *Paris and Oenone*, to his own divorce.¹ Whether Helvidius was the author or actor in the piece, or both, does not appear. In view of his high rank—Pliny, *ep.* 9. 13, calls him a *consularis*, though his name does not appear in the *Fasti*—one would be surprised to find him on the stage. The nobles whom Juvenal² attacks for debasing their rank in this way were renegades, and unworthy of their noble birth; Pliny's description of Helvidius³ character does not at all fit in with this. Helvidius was a son of the famous Helvidius Priscus who championed the cause of freedom through the reigns of Nero, Galba, Otho, Vitellius, and Vespasian, and was finally put to death by order of the last-named.⁴ The son seems to have withdrawn from political life, and possibly had no intention of satirizing Domitian in this *exodium*; it will be observed that Suetonius does not state it as a fact. It was perhaps unfortunate for him that Paris was the name of Domitia's paramour;⁵ but that may have been a coincidence beside the point, for Suetonius seems to imply that in Domitian's mind he had been travestied as the faithless Paris, and Domitia as the deserted Oenone. In chapter 22 of the same biography is a record of the emperor's passion, after his marriage to Domitia, for his own niece Julia, the wife of Flavius Sabinus; here perhaps is Helen of Troy.

It will be noticed that the play to which exception was taken is not called a mime but a *scaenicum exodium*. Towards the end of Cicero's life, as we have seen, mimes were becoming more frequent than Atellans as *exodia*. But Atellans were not excluded, for we have already met the *Atellanicum exodium* in which Tiberius figured as the old goat of Capri. As there is no other instance from this century of mimes venting their scurrilous abuse on the emperors, but several occasions when this was done by the Atellan actors, there is strong presumptive evidence that this play of Paris and Oenone was yet another version of the old Oscan farce.⁶ Subjects taken from Greek mythology were common enough in the literary Atellan; Pomponius wrote an *Agamemno Suppositus* and a *Marsyas*,⁷ while Novius was the author of *Hercules Coactor* and *Phoenissae*. In the *Maccus* of Pomponius (64 R.) Diomedes was one of the characters. Juvenal (vi. 71) refers to Autonoe as a character in an Atellan farce.

In the second century A.D. the popularity of the Atellan farce diminished until it was scarcely to be found in any part of Italy. The mime, however, carried on the assault upon imperial frailties. It was an age of greater tolerance on the part of the authorities. The mimograph Marullus often attacked the co-regents Marcus Aurelius

¹ Suet. *Dom.* 10. 4: 'Occidit et Helvidium filium, quasi scaenico exodio sub persona Paridis et Oenones divortium suum cum uxore taxasset.'

² viii. 185 ff.

³ loc. cit., also 4. 21.

⁴ Tac. *Ann.* 13. 28; *Hist.* 4. 5-6 and 43, &c.

⁵ Suet. *Dom.* 3. 1: 'Eandem Paridis histrionis amore deperditam repudiavit, intraque breve tempus impatiens desiderii, quasi efflagitante

populo, reduxit.' Cf. also Dio Cass. 67. 3. 1.

⁶ It could scarcely have been a pantomime, for it is difficult to see how a performance in dumb show could have conveyed the impression of topical allusions. There is, in any case, no evidence that pantomimes were ever used as *exodia*.

⁷ His *Atalanta*, *Sisyphus*, and *Ariadne* are not certainly Atellans.

and Verus with impunity.¹ When, in A.D. 162, Verus led his army eastwards against the Parthians, who had overrun Syria and annihilated a Roman legion, natural prudence overcame his martial upbringing, and he made his head-quarters in Antioch, leaving to his general Cassius the active prosecution of the war. Whether for this reason, or another, he suffered ridicule from the mimes of Antioch: 'risui fuit omnibus Syris, quorum multa ioca in theatro in eum exstant'.² Yet he himself found amusement in the mimes, for in his next chapter Capitolinus tells us that, after the victories which Verus thus obtained by proxy, he brought home *scurrae mimarii* from Syria, as well as flute-players and lyre-players and jugglers, 'ut videretur bellum non Parthicum sed histrionicum confecisse'. The mimes were again somewhat in the privileged position of the Court Jester of medieval times.

Their jests were, however, not always in the best of taste. Capitolinus³ tells us, for instance, that Marcus Aurelius' wife, Faustina, had an affair with Tertullus. One day, when the emperor was seated among the audience, watching the performance of a mime, the *stupidus*—who in mimic adultery plays regularly took the part of the cuckolded husband⁴—turned to a slave on the stage and asked him for the name of his wife's lover. The slave replied, 'Tullus Tullus Tullus'. The *stupidus*, pretending not to understand, questioned him again. The slave replied, 'Iam tibi dixi ter Tullus'. If the stage lover was supposed to bear the name Tullus, the pun is introduced very neatly indeed. The consequent association, in the minds of the audience, of the emperor with the *stupidus* would add a special savour to the jest.

Under a less tolerant emperor such an audacious and ill-mannered allusion would surely have cost the presumptuous actor his life. But Marcus Aurelius would seem to have listened to it with the same tolerance, or lack of comprehension, that he showed towards all Faustina's alleged profligacies. In his *Meditations*⁵ he praises his wife's virtue in words that have the ring of sincerity, while even Capitolinus, who alone mentions Faustina's infidelities,⁶ speaks of the emperor's great grief at her death, and the honours bestowed upon her by the Senate.⁷ The reader is driven to one of two conclusions: either Marcus Aurelius was completely blind to his wife's scandalous behaviour—and this one can hardly credit—or that her behaviour was not in fact scandalous. In the latter case, Capitolinus' story of the mime is, of course, also fictitious.

Commodus, who succeeded Marcus Aurelius on the imperial throne, was in all things unlike his philosophical father. He seems to have been on friendly terms with the mimes, and, if Aelius Lampridius is to be believed, so far forgot his position as to try his own hand at some branches of their art.⁸ But when their jests at his expense passed the bounds of decency, he did not hesitate to take stringent measures to prevent their scurrility becoming known to the public. 'Appellatus est a mimis quasi obstupratus, eosdemque ita ut non apparerent subito deportavit.'⁹

¹ Cap. *Vita M. Ant. phil.* 8: 'Adepti imperium, ita civiliter se ambo egerunt, ut lenitatem Pii nemo desideraret, cum eos Marullus sui temporis mimographus cavillando impune perstringeret.'

² Cap. *Verus*, 7. 4.

³ Cap. *M. Ant. phil.* 29.

⁴ Juv. viii. 196-7.

⁵ I. 17.

⁶ Cap. *M. Ant. phil.* 19 and 29. Both he and Dio Cassius report the rumour that she was involved in, even largely responsible for, the rebellion made against him by Cassius, but both writers admit that the case was unproved; cf. Dio Cass. 71. 22 and 29. Faustina's honour is upheld by H. D. Sedgwick, *Marcus Aurelius*,

Yale U.P., 1921, pp. 188-9, 204.

⁷ Cap. *M. Ant. phil.* 26; cf. 19. Dio Cass. 71. 30-1; Eutrop. 8. 5.

⁸ Lamp. *Com.* 1: 'Iam [tam: *Salmasius*] in his artifex quae stationis imperatoriae non erant, ut . . . saltaret, cantaret, sibilaret [i.e. played the flute], scurram denique et gladiatorem se perfectum ostenderet.' Cf. Malalas, *Chron.*, pp. 285-6, ed. L. Dindorf, Bonn, 1831. *Scurra* is perhaps here used in the sense of *scurra mimicus*, for which see Capitolinus' story on the next page. Cf. Reich, p. 199.

⁹ Lamp. *Com.* 3. 4. There is another reading, 'appareret'.

But the love of criticism continued. In the middle of the next century a daring attack was made upon Maximinus I, the son of a Gothic father and a German mother, whose huge stature and undisguised brutality raised him for a brief period to the imperial dignity. Taking advantage of his ignorance of Greek, a mime uttered a series of baleful verses in that language, when the emperor was present. The story is told simply and vividly by Capitolinus.¹

'Neque enim crudelius animal in terris: omnia sic in viribus suis ponens quasi non posset occidi. denique cum immortalem se prope crederet ob magnitudinem corporis sui virtutisque, mimus quidam in theatro praesente illo dicitur versus Graecos dixisse, quorum haec erat Latina sententia:

"Et qui ab uno non potest occidi, a multis occiditur.

Elephas grandis est, et occiditur.

Leo fortis est, et occiditur.

Tigris fortis est, et occiditur.

Cave multos, si singulos non times."

Et haec imperatore ipso praesente iam dicta sunt. sed cum Maximinus interrogaret amicos, quid mimicus scurra dixisset, dictum est ei, quod antiquos versus cantaret contra homines asperos scriptos; et ille, ut erat Thrax et barbarus, credidit.'

In A.D. 260 the emperor Valerian was taken by the Persians, and remained in captivity until his death. His son, Gallienus, who had been associated with him in the purple, and now found himself sole emperor, made no effort to secure his release, or even to avenge him. Returning from a campaign against his own mutinous soldiers in Byzantium, whom he had treacherously killed when they surrendered under promise of liberty, he tried to draw wool over the eyes of the people of Rome by entering the city accompanied by a sumptuous procession.² It is doubtful whether the populace was deceived; the mimes³ certainly were not. As we have seen in the story of Vespasian's funeral, it was the custom for mimes to enliven processions by spontaneous jests of their own composition. Gallienus had among his supposed captives a number of Persians, whom he had found in Byzantium. The mimes went in and out among these, scrutinizing each face with care, and studying them with mock reverence. When asked why they were doing this, they replied: 'We're looking for the emperor's father.'

Unfortunately Gallienus was not the man to be influenced by any feelings of shame, and he had the daring jesters burnt alive. 'Quod populus factum', says Pollio, 'tristius quam quisquam existimaret tulit: milites vero ita doluerunt, ut non multo post vicem redderent.' In A.D. 268 the emperor was slain by his own soldiers.

This is the last recorded occasion on which the mimes sharpened their wits at the expense of an emperor. Their opinion of their rulers throughout the years can scarcely be better summarized than in the petulant remark of a *scurra mimicus* in the reign of the emperor Claudius, who succeeded Gallienus: 'in uno anulo bonos principes posse perscribi atque depingi'.⁴ But it is not to be suggested that from this time onwards the popular comedy changed its tune. There can be little doubt that the voices of the mimes were still continually uplifted against oppression and cruelty while the Western Empire was sinking to its end, just as Laberius' voice had been uplifted in the days of the dying Republic. In the Byzantine world for a certainty their independent spirit lived on. The sophist Choricus of Gaza, writing in the sixth

¹ *Max. duo* ix. 2-5.

² Treb. Pollio, *Gallieni duo*, 7-9.

³ Pollio calls them simply *scurrae*. The *Historiae Augustae Scriptores* frequently designate mimes by the terms *scurrae mimici*, *scurrae*

mimarii. See above, *Capit. Max. duo* 9; id. *Verus* 8; *Vopiscus, Aurel.* 42; Prudentius in Migne, *P.L.* lx. 316 'dum scurra saltas fabulam'.

⁴ *Vopiscus, Aurel.* 42.

century, saw in them a powerful force for the improvement of society. Those whom the mimes ridicule, he said,¹ will stop their anti-social actions completely, or at least in part, or at the very worst will be ashamed and try to conceal them. Even the great, and the friends of the great, do not dare to cavil at the mimes, for they speak with the voice of the people: *Μίμοις πάρεστι σκώπτειν ἀφόβως*.

R. W. REYNOLDS.

COLERAINE, NORTHERN IRELAND.

¹ *Apologia Mimorum* 120-1 (pp. 371-2 in the Teubner edition) = 14. 10-11 ed. Graux (*Revue de Philologie*, i (1877), p. 238).

RITUAL ELEMENTS IN THE NEW COMEDY

(1)

THE New Comedy as an art form is descended both from the Old Comedy and from fifth-century Tragedy. It is a middle style of the sort that Diderot called *le genre sérieux*. On the one side it made an expurgation of the Old Comedy by dropping the gross elements of the primitive ritual κῶμος which still survived in Aristophanes, the phallic dress, the γεφυρισμός in language, and the reckless personal satire, while it kept and emphasized the final *Gamos*, or union of lovers, and developed a more elaborate plot. On the other side it reformed Tragedy by getting rid of the supernatural stories and the stiff conventions. To quote some words of my own written in 1912, it 'introduced all the simplifications and improvements which seem to a modern'—I meant a modern philistine—'so obviously desirable. It developed an easy colloquial language, a flexible and unexacting metre. It left the Chorus quite outside the play, a kind of *entr'acte*, not worth writing down. It frankly abandoned religious ritual'—please observe that statement, which I now wish to correct—'and heroic saga. It drew its material from the adventures and emotions of contemporary middle class life, and boldly invented its own plots.' Menander in particular was considered in antiquity to have held a mirror up to life; a verse by Aristophanes of Byzantium asks,

O Menander, O Life, which of you has copied the other?

Now, it is easy to understand how such an impression was made on critics who compared the new style of play either to the wild extravagances of the Old Comedy or to the miraculous legends and heroic diction of Tragedy, though modern critics, accustomed to much greater realism, would I think feel differently, and a different impression is produced by a phrase of Satyrus in his fragmentary *Life of Euripides*. He puts in the mouth of one of his characters the statement that Euripides really created the New Comedy: both by his intimate scenes between husband and wife, father and son, slave and master, and particularly, by his 'ravished maidens, supposititious children, recognitions (ἀναγνωρίσεις) by rings and necklaces, and reversals of fortune (περιπέτειαι), which incidents form the frame of the New Comedy (τὰ συνέχοντα)'.

I propose to discuss the nature and meaning of the type of drama here attributed to Euripides and Menander, and thereby to get some light on the essential nature of the New Comedy.

(2)

But first let us remind ourselves of a point which, under the influence of the modern theatre, we are apt to forget: that drama, both comic and tragic, was a *Sacer Ludus*, a sacred play, performed on the Festival of Dionysus, in the Theatre of Dionysus, under the presidency of the Priest of Dionysus, by performers who were officially known as Διονύσου τεχνῖται. We may remember also that *ludi scenici* were introduced into Rome in the year 361 B.C. as a magic cure for a pestilence, i.e. as a sort of Fertility Charm. With this in mind, let us begin by taking some examples of the sort of tragedy which Satyrus specially connects with the New Comedy. We shall find in it a sequence of five stages: at the beginning the ravished maiden and the exposed or foundling baby; at the end the Recognition or Revelation, and the Reversal of Fortune; to which presumably we must add in the middle, since each play must have some story of its own, the troubles and sufferings caused by the ravishment, especially to the wronged mother. A sequence of these five stages is found in one of

the complete tragedies of Euripides and in many of the fragmentary plays. I give in each case not the full plot with all its turns and ingenuities, but the mere skeleton.

ION. The princess Creusa ravished by the god Apollo; baby born and exposed, brought up as foundling at Delphi; consequent sufferings of the mother and threatened death of the son. Recognition by means of the cradle and *γνωρίσματα*; Peripeteia, mother and son united, Ion received as prince.

ALOPE, daughter of Kerkyon, ravished by the god Poseidon; baby exposed, nursed by a mare; found by shepherds, who dispute over the robe in which the child was wrapped, and brought to King Kerkyon; Alope imprisoned or condemned to death, baby again exposed. Revelation by Poseidon; Peripeteia, Alope rescued; the baby Hippothous made king of Eleusis. Kerkyon killed.

ANTIOPE, daughter of Nycteus, ravished by Zeus in satyr form; twins, Amphion and Zethus, born and exposed on Cithaeron, found by shepherds; mother imprisoned by Lycus and Dirce, escapes and flies to Cithaeron. Revelation by shepherds, who tell the twins that the runaway slave is their mother; Peripeteia, mother released, twins made kings of Thebes. Lycus and Dirce killed.

AUGE. Princess, daughter of Aleos, ravished by Heracles; baby Telephus born in temple of Athena Alea, exposed on Mt. Parthenion, fed by deer; mother condemned to be buried alive by angry father. Recognition by ring. Heracles reveals all. Peripeteia, Auge rescued. Telephus made king of Mysia.

MELANIPPE. Two plays, the *Wise* and the *Prisoner*. Different plots but the five elements in both.

(1) *The Wise*. Melanippe, daughter of Hellen, ravished by Poseidon; twins, Aeolus and Boeotus, born and exposed, fed by cow; brought in to Hellen, condemned to be burnt as *τέματα*. Melanippe's speech to save them betrays her. Apparently she is condemned too. Revelation by her mysterious mother Hippe, daughter of Chiron. End not known.

MELANIPPE (2) *The Prisoner*. Ravished by Poseidon: twins exposed but found by shepherd and adopted as her own by Theano, childless queen of Metapontus. Meantime Melanippe blinded and imprisoned by angry father. Later Theano has children of her own, sends her brothers to kill Aeolus and Boeotus, who conquer them and fly to the shepherds. Revelation by Poseidon. Peripeteia. Melanippe released, sight restored. Theano kills herself. Aeolus and Boeotus in both plays become founder-kings of the Aeolians and Boeotians.

ALCMENE. Ravished by Zeus; Heracles born. Fate doubtful; Pherekydes in *Apld.* ii. 62 says snakes sent by Amphitryon to kill him, *Diod.* iv. 9 says exposed by Alcmena. Alcmena condemned to be burnt, but pyre put out by Zeus in a tremendous thunder-storm. Revelation by Zeus. Peripeteia. Sophocles' play *TYRO* belongs to the same type:

TYRO, daughter of Salmoeneus, ravished by Poseidon in form of the river Enipeus; twins born, Pelias and Nereus; thrown into the river in a cradle-boat *σκάφη*; a Hippophorbus rescues them. Mother beaten by her stepmother Sidero. Her mask, Pollux says, is *πελιδνή*, 'livid' or 'black and blue'. Recognition by means of the *σκάφη*. Peripeteia. Sidero killed, Tyro released.

Very similar is the *HYPsipyle*:

That heroine is not ravished exactly, but irregularly wedded by Jason; twins, Euneos and perhaps Thoas. On other grounds Hypsipyle exiled and enslaved; twins probably exposed or sentenced to death. Rescued by Orpheus. They find their mother at Nemea about to be put to death because the child she was nursing has been killed by a snake; Recognition by means of a Golden Vine; Peripeteia. Hypsipyle saved. Mourning for the child.

There are some similar elements in the Danae myth and in that of Canace, daughter of Aeolus. This monotony of incident in a whole series of plays cannot surely be due to mere lack of invention in a poet who was freely choosing his plots. It must have some more or less compulsory or customary origin. And indeed, as soon as we raise the question we cannot but follow a suggestion made by Professor Cornford in his *Origin of Attic Comedy*, p. 153, and recognize some of the well-known elements in the ritual myth of the Year God or Vegetation God, as it appears for example in the typical Mummers' Play. There we have the Year God as a mysterious baby who grows up with surprising speed, like Heracles, like Hermes in the *Ichneutae* and the Hymn, like the Aloeidae who grew nine cubits in nine half-years; he fights a dark or withered adversary and triumphantly marries and has his Komos. Then he fights again, is slain and mourned, but ultimately reborn, recognized, and rejoiced over. In the tragedies we have noticed, however, the central figure is not the child but the mother, the unfortunate princess. Let us look at the Year-Story again from the point of view of Mother Earth. We have then: first stage, the Earth is impregnated by a Sky-god; second, the Spring-Child is born but is not yet visible, hidden away under the ground in desolate places; third, the Earth is without fruit and starves; it is the time when, as Alcman¹ puts it, *σάλλει μὲν, ἐσθίειν δ' ἄδαν οὐκ ἔστιν*; fourth, the new corn or fruit becomes visible and is revealed and recognized; finally *ἡνέκαμεν, συγκαίρομεν*; we have the Peripeteia and the Komos. Just the five stages which, unless my analysis has been in some way which I do not see arbitrary or artificial, we found in that list of Euripidean and Sophoclean tragedies.²

(3)

Do not these observations give us a clue to the two problems that are most puzzling about the New Comedy, the curious monotony of theme which persists in spite of the multifarious variations that are played upon it, and the absurd and really incredible immorality of the society they are supposed to portray—the same in a whole long series of plays—in which almost every heroine is, as a matter of course, seduced or violated, and every baby concealed, lost, stolen, or exposed? Was there some peculiar lack of inventive power in successive generations of these highly original and successful dramatists? Or again was the age educated by Aristotle and the great Stoic moralists so totally lost to social decency that rapes and exposures were the rule rather than the exception and all children of any importance were foundlings? No doubt the fact that a father had a legal right to rear or refuse to rear any child born to him, together with the known risks of midnight festivals attended by women, made it easier for the incidents of the Ritual Myth to be accepted on the stage without protest. They would account for an occasional foundling, but not for an omnipresent foundling.

Menander's heroine has, of course, a human lover, not a god; and is generally seduced or ravished at some midnight festival. Aelian speaks of 'Menander's young puppies disgracing themselves at midnight services'. We know from Plato and Euripides that such incidents occurred, and may presume that they were a survival from the primitive *γάμοι ἐν ἑορταῖς* of which we have abundant evidence both in ancient and medieval times. In the second stage we have the baby or twins exposed, lost, or kidnapped, always saved, but unknown; generally in some poor or slavish

¹ Fr. 76, Bergk⁴.

² Among the lost plays of Sophocles the following seem to have this form of plot: with a Ravishment, a child of unknown parentage, an Anagnorisis and Petipeteia: *Aleadae, Alexandros, Euryalus, Thyestes, Hipponous, Ion or Creusa,*

Odysseus Acanthoplex, Tyro, Chryses. Possibly *Athamas* and *Danae*. I can find no example in the fragmentary plays of Aeschylus, who of course has many definitely Bacchic plays: *Bacchae, Bassarae, Dionusou Trophoi, Edoni, Kabiri, Neaniskoi, Xantriai, Pentheus, Semele.*

condi
is cau
always
a Kom
in wh
moth
he ger
Tyro)

Le
enoug
EPITR
Ma
th
qu
pro
fift
ma
PERIK
tw
po
ill-
by
Alc

SAMIA
exp
sec

Th
the sc

KOLAX
a I

Pro
in 7

GEORG
bor

KITHA
dau
cha

KONEL
day

to c

MISUM
not

fath

PERINT
Sed

mar

PHASM
dau
Dio
Rev

condition. The mother is somehow reduced to suffering, some well-merited annoyance is caused to the 'young puppy' or hero. A Revelation or Recognition follows and is always, of course, brought about by ordinary human means; the end is invariably a Komos or rejoicing, and a marriage or, indeed, several marriages. This is a point in which Comedy suits the ritual better than Tragedy; Euripides makes his reunited mother and child 'live happy ever after', but since Tragedy is by nature a *Trauerspiel*, he generally throws in the death of the villain or enemy (cf. Alope, Antiope, Melanippe, Tyro).

(4)

Let us now look at the evidence of the few plays of Menander's which are complete enough to enable us to make out the plot.

EPITREPONTES. First stage, Pamphila is violated at the Tauropolia by an Unknown Man; second, the baby is exposed with some ornaments, and saved by peasants; third, Pamphila is neglected and ill-treated by her husband; fourth, the peasants quarrel over the child's possessions and by means of a ring which was among them provide the Revelation that the Unknown Man was Pamphila's husband himself; fifth, rejoicing and re-uniting of Pamphila and her husband, also probably another marriage and general rejoicing. The sequence here is complete.

PERIKEIROMENE. The first stage is lacking or else misplaced. The mother of the twins was not ravished. They were, however, exposed and were rescued by a poor woman. The girl twin was given to live with a soldier as his housemate; ill-treated and cast off by the soldier owing to a misunderstanding; Revelation by means of an embroidered robe in which the twins were wrapped (cf. Euripides' Alope); re-union with soldier, two marriages, perhaps three.

SAMIA. The heroine Plango has been seduced by Moschio; baby born; not exactly exposed but got rid of and handed on as supposititious child to Chrysis. Persecution of Chrysis; Revelation, rejoicing; re-union and marriage.

The other fragmentary plays are too scanty to give any complete sequence, but the scenes they do give are suggestive.

KOLAX. A free girl-child—presumably lost or exposed—has been sold by pirates to a Leno. The action takes place at time of the Festival of Aphrodite Pandemos. Probably there was some scene which served as a model for the central incident in Terence's *Eunuchus*.

GEORGOS. Myrrhina's daughter has been ravished by an Unknown Man; baby is born. Embarrassment. No more extant.

KITHARISTA. At the Festival of Deipnophoria at Ephesus Moschio saw the beautiful daughter of Phantias the harp-player . . . No more; but we shall hardly be uncharitable in surmising the worst.

KONEIAZOMENAE. Seduced girl is about to be given in marriage to what in Victorian days was called 'Another' . . . The situation is such that two women are intending to drink poison.

MISUMENOS. The heroine Krateia is a captive of war. How she became so we do not hear. She is bought by a soldier and hates him. Misunderstandings. Her father finds her. Revelation; no doubt followed by rejoicing and marriage.

PERINTHIA. Child shipwrecked, picked up by islander, father of courtesan Chrysis. Seduced by Pamphilus; baby born. Misunderstandings. Revelation and happy marriages.

PHASMA. A woman, now married to a widower with a grown-up son, has had a daughter whose birth she has had to conceal. (Perhaps violated at Feast of Dionysia?) Stepson takes the mysterious daughter for a ghost. There is a Revelation, rejoicing, and marriage.

Let us now turn back to the first play in the Lefevre papyrus, the *HEROS*. It is a badly mutilated fragment, but the outlines of the plot can be made out. It not only gives the regular ritual story but gives it twice over. Before the play began a young woman, Myrrhine, was ravished by an unknown man; gave birth to twins, Gorgias and Plangon, who, whether exposed or not, somehow were reared in the house of a slave, Tibeios. Myrrhine meantime has discovered and married her ravisher, Pheidias; Violation and Recognition number one. To pass to the second generation, Tibeios dies and Gorgias borrows from his real father, Pheidias, the money needed for the burial of his supposed father. He then proceeds to work off his debt by going with his sister to serve among the slaves in Pheidias' farm. Here Plangon is duly ravished or seduced—probably at the feast or the temple of Athena Alea where Euripides' Auge met with her misfortune—and gives birth to a child. One of her fellow-slaves Daos, who is in love with her, takes the blame of this bad action upon himself and claims to marry her. Here our information fails. We only know that there is a widespread Revelation and recognition; and Plangon, now a free citizen, is married to her penitent ravisher.

This evidence, meagre as it is, allows one to see a point which is highly characteristic of Ritual Plays. The rite is fundamental, the myth or story is secondary, and may be varied so long as it contains somewhere the fixed elements of the rite. For example, in the Osiris-Dionysus ritual there must be a Sparagmos, but in the *Bacchae* and Aeschylus' *Edoni* it is not the god who is torn in pieces but the god's enemy made to look like the god in the god's dress. In the *Andromache* every incident of the ritual is present but each one occurs to a different person. So in these comedies the woman seduced is sometimes the heroine, sometimes the heroine's mother, sometimes both, as in the *Herodas*; the magic baby which in the original Ritual Myth grows within the half-year from baby to bridegroom, in the comedies must cease to be magical and either remains a normal though inconvenient baby or is discovered to have been an inconvenient baby many years ago.

This will explain some varieties in the plots of the *dimidiatus Menander*, Terence. *ANDRIA*. Glycerium as a baby was shipwrecked and lost, but adopted by the father of Chrysis the Courtesan: she is seduced by Pamphilus. Trouble ensues, till she is revealed as the true daughter of an Athenian citizen; then marriage and rejoicing.

HAUTONTIMORUMENOS. Antiphila as a baby was sent to be exposed but was secretly brought up by a Corinthian woman. She belongs to the courtesan or slave class, but is virtuous and industrious. Seduced by Clinia. Troubles ensue; Revealed as daughter of Chremes and therefore a true citizen. Marriage and rejoicing.

EUNUCHUS. Pamphila as a baby was taken by pirates, given by a merchant to the mother of the courtesan Thais and brought up as Thais' sister. Violated by Chaereas in a brutal scene more suited to Wycherley than Menander. Troubles ensue. Revealed as citizen; marriage and rejoicing.

PHORMIO. A Lemnian woman has been seduced, or rather bigamously married, by Chremes; daughter not exposed as a baby but left deserted and friendless in Athens. Secretly married by Antiphon. Trouble; Revelation, marriage.

Here there is a sort of *ersatz* exposure and *ersatz* seduction. Except for the analogy of the other plays one would not suspect the existence of the Year-Ritual pattern in the elaborate and ingenious plot of the *Phormio*.

HECYRA. Cf. Menander's *Epitrepontes*. Philumena, wife of Pamphilus, has been violated by an Unknown Man in the dark. Baby born, and about to be exposed or got rid of; complicated troubles to her mother and mother-in-law as well as herself. Revelation that the Unknown man was her husband Pamphilus. Reunion of three husbands and wives. Rejoicing.

ADELPHOE. Pamphila seduced by Aeschinus: baby born. Much confusion; Revelation that she is daughter of Athenian citizen. Marriage, or two marriages, and rejoicing.

It would be tedious to go through all the fragments of the New Comedy in this way, but I may take from some notes of Legrand, who has no suspicions about a ritual origin for these peculiarities, a few general points about them, illustrating the emphasis on fertility and the processes connected therewith.

First, we find a marriage, or, we may say, as many marriages as possible, forming the regular conclusion, 'Le dénouement comique par excellence', says Legrand. It not only occurs regularly at the end of the play, but much is made of preparations for marriage in the *Samia*, *Georgos*, *Plokion*, *Sikyonios* (?), *Paidion* (?); also *Aulularia* and *Casina*. Cf. the titles of Menander's *Πρόγαμοι*, *Δημιουργός*, and the *Ἀνακαλύπτων*, *Ἀνακαλυπτομένη* of Philemon and Euangelos.

An actual childbirth takes place in the play: *Πλόκιον*, *Γεωργός*, *Ἡρώς*, *Ἰμβριοι*, *Ἀλκίς* (prob.), *Adelphoe*, *Andria*, *Hecyra*, *Aulularia*, and the *Philopator* of Turpilius (*Daos*, p. 254). Previous secret births in *Ἡρώς*, *Ἐπιτρέποντες*, *Σαμία*, *Φάσμα*, Plautus' *Cistellaria* and *Truculentus*. The exposed baby, as we have noticed, like its divine prototype, often has an *ersatz* exposure; it may be lost, kidnapped, shipwrecked, stolen. It falls into the possession sometimes of honest people, as in the *Perikeiromene*; often into that of a Leno or a courtesan. A Recognition or Revelation of the Truth always takes place, and Legrand has analysed the various methods of discovery. It is sometimes after deliberate search as in *Καρχηδόνιος*, *Μισοῦμενος*, Plautus' *Poenulus*, *Menaechmi*. (This gives occasion for really touching scenes.) Sometimes by the child's own memories, *Captivi*, *Curculio*, *Menaechmi*; by the evidence of witnesses, *Captivi*, *Cistellaria*, *Casina*, *Epidicus*, *Poenulus*, *Andria*; by *γνωρίσματα* or *σημεῖα*, much the most common and, as Aristotle says, the least artistic method; Legrand quotes fifteen plays. The *σημεῖα* are generally, however, used in connexion with some other evidence. Sometimes it is the ravisher who is recognized (*Ἐπιτρέποντες*, *Ἡρώς*, *Φάσμα*, *Πλόκιον*, *Ὑποβολιμαῖος*, *Hecyra*, *Cistellaria*). In the tragic model this is almost always the case. If anyone is still disposed to think that these somewhat disreputable plots are due merely to a realistic presentation of the manners of the 'young puppies' of an immoral age, and not to some fixed fertility pattern, conscious or unconscious, let me shatter his complacency with one blow. Plutarch says expressly that in all Menander's hundred dramas there is no case of *παιδὸς ἄρρενος ἔρως* (*Quaest. Conv.* 8. 3. 8). The context makes it clear that he is taking Menander as typical of the New Comedy, not as contrasted with the other writers. A realistic description of an immoral age would have abounded in *ἄρρην ἔρως*. A fertility ritual has no place for it.

(5)

Supposing this argument is on the whole right and that the Drama performed on the Festival of Dionysus in the Theatre of Dionysus by οἱ Διονύσου τεχνῖται was likely to be based on a Dionysiac ritual, can we draw any conclusions about the history of Comedy and Tragedy? As to Comedy I would suggest that when the reform of the Old Comedy took place it was felt on the one hand that τὰ φαλλικά were unseemly and must be got rid of, on the other hand that a fertility ritual proper to Dionysus must be preserved. In place of a rather disordered phallic ceremony with a Contest and a final Gamos there was put a regular ritual of the Year Baby such as was already recognized in Tragedy. The first known example of the new style is the *Kokalos* of Aristophanes, the last of his plays, or last but one if the *Aiolosikon* is later. In that, so the ancient Life tells us, 'he introduces a seduction and recognition and all the other elements adopted by Menander' (*Vita*, xxviii. 69). It would be interesting to know more about the *Aiolosikon*. Both these plays were parodies, or comic treatments, of

legends used in Tragedy. If, as seems possible though not so probable as to make me include it in my list, Euripides' *Aiolos* was really a play of the Year Baby type, the *Aiolosikon* would be like the *Kokalos*.

These considerations about Comedy seem to me to suggest an interesting possibility about the history of Tragedy also. The Theatre of Dionysus was, as we know, singularly hospitable to alien myths and rituals. Normally the proper place to perform a ritual was the shrine of the hero to whom that ritual pertained. The death of Hippolytus was celebrated at the grave of Hippolytus in Trozen, that of Medea's children at Corinth, that of Aias as a procession to his grave in Salamis; the various legends of Suppliants at an altar were commemorated at the altar which had protected them. But for some reason or other all were admitted to the Theatre of Dionysus. This may have been because Dionysus was the patron of drama in general and had the most suitable and convenient *Theatron*. We should also remember that, though Tragedy was the *sacer ludus* of Dionysus, it was forbidden to mention the name of Dionysus in connexion with death (Hdt. ii. 61, 86, 132, 170). Consequently the innumerable Year Myths or Fertility Myths, which were all more or less akin to Dionysus, though his name was not mentioned in them, formed specially suitable material. (As far as I can make out all were welcome at the Dionysia except the myths of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, which belonged to Apollo and had their place at the Panathenaea.) At any rate it is abundantly clear that this invasion of non-Dionysiac subjects at the Dionysia was felt and even perhaps resented. The phrase *οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον*, and still more the extraordinary adjective *ἀπροσδιόνυσος*, 'irrelevant', are ample proof of that. I wonder if, in the history of Attic tragedy, there may have been the following stages:

I. A first stage in which the subjects were really Dionysiac. At least nine of Aeschylus' lost plays were about Dionysus, and all the ancient criticisms of him dwell on the Bacchic or Dionysiac character of his writing. The titles of the plays attributed to Thespis, whether genuine or not, seem markedly Dionysiac; and though it is not clear what Aristotle meant in saying that tragedy *ἐκ τοῦ σατυρικοῦ μετέβαλεν*, it seems to imply an early Dionysiac stage of tragedy.

II. A gradual introduction of other myths, first, perhaps, of fertility or Year Rituals such as had some kinship with Dionysus, but afterwards of almost any myth that was suitable for dramatic treatment. One decisive moment must have been when Aeschylus himself introduced his *τεμάχη τῶν Ὀμήρου μεγάλων δείπνων*, 'slices from the great banquets of the Epic tradition'. This is the moment when Tragedy in Aristotle's phrase *ὁψὲ ἀπεσεμνύθη*.

III. A reaction against this extreme freedom as *οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον* and a conscious effort to get back—at least sometimes—to subjects really relevant to the Year God. In the Excursus which I contributed to Jane Harrison's *Themis* I showed that certain plays contained all the features of the Osiris ritual: a Contest; a Sparagmos or similar ritual death, always related by a Messenger; a *threnos* or Lamentation; a Recognition and Theophany. I was wrong, as Mr. Pickard-Cambridge pointed out, in attributing too exclusive and original an importance to this type of play, but its existence is clear, and is best explained, I think, as an attempt to get back to Dionysus when he seemed to be neglected.

A second attempt to get back, I would suggest, was the type of play I have been here discussing, expressing what I may call the Year-Baby Ritual. No doubt there are others; for example, the sequence of Old King, Young King, Avenger, with the wife of the Old King helping the Young King to kill the Old, or cast him out as a *pharmakos*, or at least make him barren—like Gaia and Rhea in Hesiod, Clytemnestra in the Atridae legend, or Gertrude in the Hamlet legend. But that, as Mr. Kipling used to say, is another story.

There are also certain incidents not essential to the plot, and sometimes indeed rather repugnant to it, which occur repeatedly in plays of the New Comedy. Why, for instance, if the story requires a forbidden γάμος, is it practically never made a real love-affair in which the normal audience, ancient as much as modern, can take some sympathetic interest? Why is it mostly a mere violation, a crime very severely condemned and punished by Greek law and calculated to disgust an audience with the 'young puppy' who has to be the hero of the drama? Legrand says it is to protect the modesty of the heroine. It would have shocked an ancient audience if she had any part in a love story. I suspect the real reason is that the human story is simply modelled on the supernatural myth. Apollo, Poseidon, or Heracles did not pay any regard to the feelings of the legendary heroines who had attracted them; they simply worked their will.

Again, we are all familiar with the problems surrounding the thunder-storm and earthquake with which Dionysus wrecked the house of Pentheus in Euripides and of Lycurgus in Aeschylus. I am quite prepared to believe what my elders and betters tell me, that it is a symbol of the first spring thunder-storm. At any rate it clearly belongs to the ritual myth. Is that why the house in the *Perikeiromene* is attacked by a drunken storming party, why in other plays there is often a storming party to liberate the heroine from the house of some Leno or other villain? There is a regular siege in Terence's *Eunuchus*, Act IV, a Leno's house is stormed in the *Adelphoe*, Act I; in the *Asinaria* (v. 2), *Bacchides* (iv. 1), *Rudens* (ii. 3 and iii), *Aulularia* (iv. 6; cf. ii. 8), *Truculentus* (ii. 1, 2), *Mostellaria* (ii. 2) there are violent assaults on doors—at times even by heroines. I note such phrases as: 'Quis tam proterve nostras aedes arietat?' 'Pultando paene perfregi fores; Quid istas aedes frangitis?' Are such scenes unconscious reverberations of some prehistoric mimesis of the fertilizing spring thunder-storm, ritualized in Tragedy, as 'tecta Penthei Disiecta non levi ruina Thracis et exitium Lycurgi'?

(6)

The power of tradition is as subtle as it is overwhelmingly strong. When fully under its influence we are unconscious of it; we merely do instinctively what we are accustomed to do, just as we talk our own language without asking why.

There is a question which inevitably haunts our minds while discussing these influences of tradition, that is, the degree of consciousness with which the tradition was followed. In the days when morning coats always had two buttons at the back we wore them, I suppose, without questioning, and were rather amused when it was pointed out that they were relics of the support for a sword-belt. Before that we had no consciousness at all of the tradition we were following. Can we suppose that Euripides, Menander, Terence, were entirely unconscious of the tradition of Dionysiac Myth or Vegetation Myth that they were following? For Terence we can say Yes. If he knew it at all he can only have learnt it as a curious piece of Greek archaeology, like the origin of the *ludi scenici* described by Livy. Otherwise I should imagine he and Plautus had no more consciousness that they were reproducing ancient myth patterns than M. Jourdain had that he was talking prose. But what of Aeschylus and Euripides?

I cannot really believe that they did not know what they were doing. Ritual was an all-pervading element in ancient art, especially in dance song and drama. They knew they were making *dramata* for the Festival of Dionysus. They also knew—what we sometimes forget—that it was forbidden to speak of Dionysus' own death; the death and rebirth of that life-spirit himself must be indicated, not explicitly stated. The idea that all myths are αἰνίγματα, ἀλληγορίαι was familiar in Greek tradition from very early times. They would find nothing fanciful or unusual about it.

In the particular case of Comedy the transition from Old to New, otherwise hard to understand, becomes at once intelligible on the hypothesis I have suggested. *Tà φαλλικά* belonged obviously to primitive fertility magic; when they became offensive to public taste their place was taken by a more refined form of fertility magic. And I hardly see how the transition can have been made unconsciously, I mean, without consciousness that the essential value of the Dionysiac fertility charm was being preserved.

OXFORD.

GILBERT MURRAY.

THER
the G
the ti
of exp
tionar
for th
This a
is an
W
both
'subor
(what
be al
ὑπηρε
in res
light
Th
see in
'units
tempt
in a s
part o
of the
on pa
from h
it was
and in
inevit
Milita
multit
also m
on the
mites
and e
recent
fortun
have
there
in the

¹ H.
his flin
τάχ
μα
² J.
pp. 137
³ C.
⁴ Ca
⁵ M.

ΥΠΗΡΕΤΗΣ

THERE is one nautical term which has been neglected by those who have written about the Greek ship—for the very good reason that it had ceased to be used literally by the time our records, literary and epigraphic, begin. This is a pity, since the silence of experts has resulted in an absurdity, or at least obscurity, appearing in the dictionaries. An unattested original meaning 'under-rower' has been universally assumed for the word *ὑπηρέτης* (e.g. Boisacq³, 'rameur en sous-ordre'; L. & S.⁴, 'under-rower'). This assumption not merely requires proof but is in sore need of explanation. What is an 'under-rower'? And why did the term pass out of use in that sense?

When *ὑπηρέτης* and its derivative *ὑπηρετέω* first appear (in Herodotus, *saepe*), both the particular transferred sense 'servant' and the general transferred sense 'subordinate' were already well established to the exclusion of the original meaning (whatever it was), and, what is more, the metaphor from seafaring usage seems to be already 'dead'. The essential note, however, in the group of words (*ὑπηρέτης*, *ὑπηρετέω*, *ὑπηρεσία*, *ὑπηρετικός*) is not hard to assess: it is *implicit, unquestioning service in response to another's authoritative bidding*. How does this meaning arise, and what light does it throw on the origin of the word?

The lexicographers' 'under-rower' explains nothing, not even itself. It is hard to see in what way variation of rank can enter into a team of such equally matched 'units' as oarsmen or how one rower can unreservedly obey his fellow. One is then tempted to seek a physical explanation of *ὑπηρέτης* in the lower position of rowers in a second 'bank'. Here we approach very dangerous ground. Already in the latter part of the nineteenth century there was no more thorny problem than the mechanics of the trireme. Scholars evolved, each in his own way, satisfactory arrangements, on paper: but practical mariners declared that some of these reconstructions, so far from being capable of propulsion, would immediately founder.¹ At that time, however, it was always assumed that banks of oars implied oarsmen seated at different levels: and indeed the words *ἀνώ* 'above' and *κατώ* 'below' seemed to make this arrangement inevitable. But in 1905² and the following year,³ and later in his book *Hellenistic Military and Naval Developments*,⁴ Dr. W. W. Tarn torpedoed the trireme and multireme of the previous generation, with their oarsmen above and below. *ἀνώ* can also mean 'aft', and *κατώ* can be taken as 'forward'. Tarn, then, keeps all the oarsmen on the same level, putting the *thranites* astern, the *zugites* amidships, and the *thalamites* in the bows. In spite of Tarn, the old view seems to linger on in popular belief, and even in more exalted circles. Mr. J. S. Morrison⁵ and Mr. R. C. Anderson⁶ have recently attempted to refloat and refit the sunken trireme. The present inquiry is fortunately not concerned with this controversy.⁷ If Tarn be right, *ὑπηρέτης* cannot have been an 'under-rower' in a positional sense: and even if he should be wrong, there are insuperable objections to a physical reference. If *ὑπό* had only a local value in the literal sphere, why should it so consistently connote *subordinate relationship*

¹ H. R. Tottenham, in the *Eagle* (1888), had his fling at the current controversy:

τάχ' ἂν δυναίμην, ὡς σοφός τις γίγνομαι,
μαθεῖν παλαιῶν ναῦν ὅπως ἤρέσσετο.

² *J.H.S.* xxv, 'The Greek Warship', esp. pp. 137-40.

³ *C.R.* xx. 1, 'Thranite, Zugite, and Thalamite'.

⁴ Cambridge, 1930, esp. p. 126 and Appendix iv.

⁵ *Mariner's Mirror*, vol. xxvii, Jan. 1941.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Oct. 1941.

⁷ But it may be useful to point out that the new Liddell and Scott has not made up its mind in the matter. Under *τρήρης* Tarn's book is cited and his view given, as also under *ζυγίτης* and *μεσόνεοι*: but *θαλαμίτης* and *θρανίτης* are explained in the old way (as 'rowers on the lowest, and topmost, bench').

in the figurative? In the second place, early as must have been the introduction of the second bank, the word *ὑπηρέτης* was probably older still. The device of arranging oars in two (or at least two) banks must date from very early times. The Boeotian vessels, each with 120 oarsmen, in *Iliad* ii. 509–10 (see Thucydides' comments thereon, i. 10. 4) suggest banks—for it is hard to believe that every increase in man-power meant a corresponding increase in the length of a boat; Herodotus mentions *τριήρεις*; Pliny, in his chronological list of human inventions (*N.H.* vii. 57), after implying that the Argo was *μονήρης* ('single-banked'), names the Erythraeans (who were they?) as the introducers of biremes (cf. Thucydides, i. 13); Phoenician biremes are represented in the Assyrian sculptures of Sennacherib (700 B.C.) and 'had probably then been in use for some considerable period' (Rawlinson's *Phoenicia*, p. 75). Our Laureate's 'Quinquereme of Nineveh' is thus only a pardonable exaggeration in number, not in kind. A further point—if we temporarily accept the old view, as expounded, say, in Torr's *Ancient Ships*—is that when the second bank was introduced, at a lower level, with some oarsmen now sitting on the ship's beams (*ζυγά*), below and between the raised thwarts (Homeric *θρήνος*, *κληῖδες*) on which the original rowers sat, the new line of oarsmen, significantly, were not called *ὑπηρέται* 'under-rowers', as might have been expected, but received a name from their seats, viz. *ζυγῖται* (as distinguished from *θρανῖται*). *ὑπηρέτης*, then, cannot have had a positional reference, for either there was no inferior seating at all or, if there was, it came into being later than the word *ὑπηρέτης*. The problem of this paper antedates the classic problem of the trireme.

Before we proceed further, a source of confusion in the dictionaries must be pointed out and its ill effects removed. Of the four chief members named earlier as forming a group of words, *ὑπηρεσία* alone is found commonly in a nautical context. The tendency, then, is to connect *ὑπηρεσία* directly with the sea. Thus L. & S.⁸ defines *ὑπηρεσία* as 'properly the service rendered by the *ὑπηρέται*, sea-service'. 'Sea-service' appears as 'rower's service' under *ὑπηρετέω*. In other words, *ὑπηρεσία* is being too consciously, too literally, associated, in meaning, with *ἐρέσσειν*. But when L. & S. then comes to cite examples of the word it is forced to contradict its initial statement, for it goes on 'but mostly used as concrete, the body of rowers and sailors, the ship's crew (romans mine), Thuc. 8. 1, Dem. 1208. 20, etc.'. More significantly still, L. & S. continues 'Thuc. opposed *ὑπηρεσίαι* to *κυβερνήται*, i. 143; to *θρανῖται*, 6. 31; and in Lysias *ὑπηρεσίαι* are opposed to *πλήρωμα*, 162. 26; in Dem. to *ναῦται*, *ἐπιβάται*, *ἐρέται*, 1209. 11, 1214. 23, 1216. 13 sq.'. So *ὑπηρεσία* can be opposed to *ἐρέται*! This vitiates the definitions. L. & S.⁹ begins equally badly: '*ὑπηρεσία*, ἡ (*ἐρέτης*) body of rowers, ship's crew'. *ἐρέτης* is certainly the ultimate etymology, but that does not justify 'body of rowers' as the opening gloss. So too Boisacq³ (1938): '*ὑπηρεσία* service de rameur, (first, and then) les matelots, service'; and Prellwitz: '*ὑπηρεσία* Rudermannschaft'. The editors of texts have treated the relevant passages cited above (which mostly reappear in L. & S.⁹) much more logically and correctly. On Thucydides vi. 31 Spratt prints as Appendix D to his edition a MS. note of the late Master of Trinity College, Cambridge,¹ the gist of which is worth quoting here: '*ὑπηρεσία* appears to be used in two different senses, both involving the same notion, the first in a wider, the second in a more restricted sense:

- (1) It may be used for the whole ship's company or ship's service as in viii. 1. 2.
- (2) It may denote the ship's servants in contradistinction to those whose employment was more definite, e.g. the *ναῦται* and *ἐπιβάται*. In this sense it occurs more than once in Demosthenes' *contra Polyclem*. The term would include

¹ W. H. Thompson, to judge by the date of the edition.

Tucke
as 'pet
of the

Th
ὑπηρεσία
to the
a remi
admit
only c
There
the se
Boeck
[on bo
soldier
more l
servan
sails,
again
figurat
also p
by ass
So it l

W
referen
simple
we can
condit
be sun
has no
ὑπηρεσία
ninth
howev
to ma
the id
of the
in a s
object
of *ὑπ*
single
ably l
boat-r
which
seated
the G
In fac
πρ

¹ Cf.
of Spa
footnot
² Gr

'carpenters, cooks, *σιτοποιοί* (vi. 22), in short all that portion of a ship's crew that could not be referred to either of the two classes mentioned above'.

Tucker on Thuc. viii. 1 prefers, with Dobree, Arnold, and Shilleto, to render *ὑπηρεσία* as 'petty officers'. A petty officer, he says, might well be called a *ὑπηρέτης* (cf. 'mate') of the captain. But in none of these contexts has *ὑπηρεσία* anything to do with *rowing*.

The conclusion one draws from a study of these and similar passages is that *ὑπηρεσία*, having already become figurative (as 'service') in all areas, was then reapplied to the naval domain. Possibly it carried with it, on its return to this its native setting, a reminiscent tang of the sea which was wholly dissipated in other contexts. But to admit this is not to suggest that its prime association here was with the oarage. It is only on a tropical ground that *ὑπηρεσία* can be contrasted with *ἐρέται* or *θραυῖται*. There is nothing new about this view of the use (as distinct from a recognition of the semasiological shift towards that use) of the word. I quote the following from Boeckh's *Public Economy of Athens*, English trans. of 1842, p. 280: 'The seamen [on board a trireme], under whom I include the whole crew with the exception of the soldiers, are called sometimes servants (*ὑπηρέται*), sometimes sailors (*ναῦται*): in a more limited sense however, the rowers (*ἐρέται*, or *κωπηλάται*) are distinct from the servants and sailors, who only comprise those who are employed at the steerage, sails, cordage, pumps, etc.'¹ Professor W. Bedell Stanford has recently warned us against reading too much into our contexts by taking words (e.g. *ἄνθος*, *γελᾶν*, *κτεῖς*) figuratively when we should have regard rather to their basic meaning.² But it is also possible to commit the opposite mistake and to distort the sense of a passage by associating a term too much with its literal application and neglecting the tropology. So it has been with *ὑπηρεσία* in the dictionaries.

We can now, unhampered by the misconception that *ὑπηρεσία* contains an explicit reference to *ἐρέσσειν*, continue the investigation, which must centre itself around the simple key-word *ὑπηρέτης*. An explanation must be found for the prefix *ὑπό*. Again we can clear the ground by rejecting any function of *ὑπό* which will not satisfy the conditions. The antiquity of the compound must be borne in mind. Thus we can be sure that *ὑπηρέσιον* (Thuc. ii. 93, and thenceforward), 'cushion beneath a rower', has nothing to do with the case. Again, Aelian (*de Nat. Animal.* xiii. 2) uses a verb *ὑπερέσσω* (translated wrongly by L. & S.⁸ 'row just behind', but correctly in the ninth edition 'row quietly'). This too can be immediately dismissed. It is useful, however, to mention these, even if to reject them at once, for the sake of completeness, to make certain that no possibility has been overlooked. Another contact between the ideas expressed by *ὑπό* and by *ἐρέτης* may be found in the semi-supine position of the oarsman at the end of his stroke with the handle of the oar in front of and, in a sense, above him. He is at that moment 'the rower beneath the oar'. But objections to this etymology are obvious and many. One would expect a compound of *ὑπό* and some form from *ἐρετμός*; the draw-back with the body is not as great in single-oar rowing as in fresh-water sculling; the vessel would require to have considerably less freeboard than would be compatible with practical needs (as distinct from boat-racing) for the handle of the oar to appear appreciably above the rower—to which may be added the fact that ancient representations of ships show the oarsmen seated relatively high; above all, this attitude did not seem to impress itself upon the Greeks. I cannot find any expression such as 'under the oar' for vigorous rowing. In fact the stress is laid in the other direction, as *ἐμβαλέειν κώπης* (*Od.* ix. 489), *προπεσόντες ἔρεσσον* (*ib.* 490; xii. 194) and the well-known *incumbere remis* of Virgil

¹ Cf. also Gilbert's *Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens*, English trans., p. 327, footnote 2.

² *Greek Metaphor*, 1936, pp. 111-17, cf. also his

'In Lexicographos' in *Greece and Rome*, v, No. 15. Compare also Jebb's famous remarks on *ναῦς*, *δρῦς*, *ἀκόνη*, *κρατήρ* in *J.H.S.* iii (1882), p. 171.

(*Aen.* v. 15; x. 294) testify.¹ Homer uses ἐρεμῶς (27), ἐλάτῃ (2), κώπῃ (3) for 'oar': the only instance that I have found of one of these words used with a significant preposition is at *Od.* xii. 171-2, ἐπ' ἐρεμὰ ἐζόμενοι, 'sitting down at the oars'² (cf. Thucydides' curious word for an oarsman, πρόσκωπος, 'the man at the oar', i. 10. 4).

We must seek some other origin for ὑπηρέτης, keeping in mind (i) the early date of the literal usage, (ii) the essential note of subservience. Let us view the matter *sub specie antiquitatis*. In very early times man learnt to propel a coracle or dug-out canoe by himself by means of a rough-hewn branch (Virgil's 'leafy oars') or a flat piece of wood. From these beginnings progress was made in seamanship: the stages can indeed be followed in the earliest pictorial monuments of Egypt. A glance at Torr's plates will show the development. First, crews paddling with their faces turned towards the bow: then a curious intermediate stage, a stylized or conventionalized representation, with the face turned towards the stern but with the oars still grasped like paddles: and finally a natural portrayal of rowing. Comparative philology, however, makes it clear that the Indo-Europeans³ not only used boats⁴ and practised the art of rowing⁵ but that they had also harnessed the wind as a driving force.⁶ This implies very considerable progress in ship-building before the Indo-European διασπορά. We cannot tell, of course, what degree of organization had been achieved, what arts and improvements were discovered and perhaps lost again, to be rediscovered afresh. But in the Hellenic domain the single oarsman (ἐρέτης, as his name was in true Indo-European lineage) found that his efforts could be supplemented with advantage by a companion, another ἐρέτης, and later, by more than one. As boats grew bigger, the man-power continued to increase, especially when still larger boats were organized for civic or national rather than private ends. I believe that the word ὑπηρέτης came into use as soon as the number of ἐρέται reached a point when it became necessary to have on board a 'time-keeper' or controller, in other words a κελευστής.⁷ All the oarsmen now became 'under-rowers' in respect of this coxswain, taking their time, orders, etc., *without question* from him. There would be no difference in rank among the oarsmen themselves: an ἐρέτης only became ὑπηρέτης when considered in his relation to the κελευστής. Thus there came into being two words for the same person or functionary, ἐρέτης and ὑπηρέτης. The existence of synonyms is notoriously a state of unstable equilibrium in language. The next step is not hard to infer: ὑπηρέτης began to acquire a figurative sense, to symbolize immediate and inevitable response to orders. We do not know the social aspect of these matters: it probably varied from time to time. But our trope of 'galley-slave' as 'drudge' or 'hack' may help to illustrate the least attractive and least honourable side of the metaphor. It may have been this pejorative turn which caused

¹ I am not discussing the *exact* meaning of these phrases.

² So Butcher and Lang. But this misrepresents the heteroclitc plural of ἐρεμῶς. It is the collective neuter akin to the abstract 'feminine' in -ā. When B. & L. translate ἐπ' ἐρεμὰ | ἐζόμενοι λεύκανον ὕδωρ ξεστῆς ἐλάτῃσι 'sat at the oars and whitened the waters with their polished pine-blades' they are hiding a tautology which they have themselves introduced behind the fact that English conveniently provides the synonyms 'blade' and 'oar'. There is no *datisme* in the Greek. It is 'sat at the oarage', 'at the place where the oars are'.

³ i.e. a 'pre-ethnic' people (or peoples) speaking a proto-Indo-European speech (or related

speeches).

⁴ The root *nāu-* appears in most of the daughter languages.

⁵ For the widespread distribution of the root *erə-*, note, in addition to Greek ἐρέτης (with ἐρε-τμός and *ἐρε-τω), the Sanskrit *ari-tras*, Latin *rēmus*, O. Irish *rāma*, O.H.G. *ruodar* ('oar'), O. Norse *róa*, Anglo-Sax. *rōwan* ('row'), Lithuanian *ir-klas* ('oar') and *ir-ti* ('row').

⁶ The Latin *malus* 'mast' has nothing to do with an apple-tree but stands for *mazdos*, and is therefore identical with the Germanic *mast*.

⁷ I am not concerned with the question whether this controller was, necessarily or at all times, also the *πρωτεύς* or helmsman.

ὑπηρ
dislik
comf
expr
'tenu
place
earlie
the
ὑπηρ
tions
demi
were
the I
C
comp
Hom
mod
acco
the r
vaile
show
later
ἀντε
Anth
as m
trib
other
ὑπηρ
and
'colle
gener
Sept
foot
meta
rowin
vying
boat
of m
really
again
defin

1 T
Soph.
by Di
2 E
Bekke
ἀντηρ
3 J
Lysia
of the
or, it
Hous
(C.Q.

ὑπηρέτης to perish in its literal application: free citizens, when rowing for the State, disliked the servile nuance acquired by the word. But probably several factors combined. It is a law of semantics that a condition ceases to be given formal expression when it becomes universal or almost universal. Thus, we now speak of 'tennis', not 'lawn tennis'. When team-rowing under a keleustes became a commonplace, the subordination of the rowers to a unifying control, which had struck an earlier age as linguistically noteworthy, no longer demanded statement. Furthermore, the alternative word ἐρέτης was there all the time, ready to win the day should ὑπηρέτης become unfashionable. There were thus at least three tendencies or conditions which would, separately or in combination, prepare the way for the ultimate demise of ὑπηρέτης as a rowing term. But whether it was these forces or others which were at work, there is no gainsaying the fact that they were effective in banishing the literal use of the word.

One or two confirmatory points may be added. The antiquity of ὑπηρέτης as a compound is shown by the long vowel. Its formation goes back, like that of many Homeric words (e.g. φιλήρετμος and δολιχήρετμος from the same root), to a primitive mode of composition. *ὑπο-ερέτης became, neither *ὑπερέτης by elision nor *ὑπουρέτης according to later rules of contraction, but ὑπέρετης. This crasis or sandhi, in which the resultant sound took its quality from the second of the concurrent vowels, prevailed at a very early stage of Greek, as augments such as ὠφέλον and ἡλθον (εἶχον) show. It is to be particularly noted that when any compound of ἐρέτης was formed later, with express reference to rowing, elision took place. Thus Thucydides uses αὐτερέται of fighting men who manned the oars as well; Antipater Sidonius (in *Anth. Pal.* vii. 637) has μοννερέτης. This variation of quantity is not to be explained as merely due to a drift towards a more pleasing rhythm by the avoidance of a tribrach (cf. σῶφώτερος, to avoid σῶφῶτῆρος), though this probably assisted. On the other hand, where the reference is not specifically to rowing, we find, in addition to ὑπηρέτης and, I believe, owing their form to this exemplar, such words as συνηρετώ and ἀντηρετής. The former, which is based on a noun συνηρέτης = σύμφωνος, 'colleague' (Photius), has been introduced into texts (= 'assist', 'befriend') in three generally accepted emendations.¹ ἀντηρέτης is used thrice by Aeschylus in the *Septem c. Thebas* (vv. 284, 595, 997), its only occurrence outside that mentioned in footnote 2. This word will repay a brief study. Is Aeschylus consciously using a metaphor from rowing? If so, what is the picture? Is it that of rival champions rowing against each other in a boat-race or sea-battle? Or of two rowers in one boat, vying with each other in skill, strength, and endurance? Or even of two men in a boat rowing against each other in opposite directions (if such were possible), a sort of marine tug-of-war? I do not think it is any of these (only the first, I suppose, is really possible).² I believe that Aeschylus is simply visualizing great effort pitted against great effort,³ but using a word with a nautical flavour (even if it raises no definite picture), agreeably to the whole atmosphere of the play.⁴ This general

¹ The best known and most important is at Soph. *Ajax*, 1329—Lobeck's emendation adopted by Dindorf, Jebb, Pearson *et cell.*

² *Et. Mag.* 112. 40 cites ἀντηρετώ, and Bekker's *Anecd. Graeca*, 411, apparently has ἀντηρέτης, in a literal sense.

³ Just as ἐξυνηρετώ (Soph. *Trach.* 1156, Lysias, *Eratosth.* 23, etc.) connotes the exertion of the utmost pains in assistance (cf. *συνηρετώ*) or, it may be, in humouring—for the latter, see Housman (*J.P.* xx, 1891, pp. 29–30) and Pearson (*C.Q.* xxiii, 1929, p. 92) on Soph. *O.T.* 217.

⁴ The *Septem* both begins and ends with the metaphor of the Ship of State, which is introduced, sometimes with much elaboration, on at least six other occasions (vv. 62, 114, 208–10, 652, 759–61, 795–6). Other figures from the ship are frequent in the play, e.g. horses' bridles called rudders (vv. 206–7), the beating of the hands in mourning compared to rowing (v. 855). Since this was written I note Stanford's remarks on the 'dominant image' of the *Septem* (Aeschylus in *His Style*, Sept. 1942, pp. 96–8).

undifferentiated sense ('effort') takes its rise from the norm set by *ὑπηρετής*. *-ηρέτης* has become little more than a grandiloquent suffix for a *nomen agentis*. The same tendency for this Indo-European root connoting 'rowing' to be universalized as 'effort', or to be given a new direction (cf., as a type, *ἵπποβούκολος*, Eur. *Phoen.* 28), is to be found in widely separated areas. The Old Irish *im-rera* 'he set out' is usually referred to this source; and a group of words in the Indo-Iranian zone connoting, like *ὑπηρετής*, 'servant' has been by some attributed to the same origin. But the latter identification is doubtful. In Greek itself, while the famous *πτερίγων ἐρετμοῖσιν ἐρεσσόμενοι* (Aesch. *Agam.* 52), like its Latin counterpart *remigio alarum* (Virg. *Aen.* i. 301) and many other imitations both Greek and Latin, is a 'straight' metaphor, such an expression as *κυλίκων ἐρέται* (Dionysius Chalcus *apud* Athenaeus, 443 D), though here coined as a joke and coupled with *συμποσίον ναῦται*, shows how easily transference or extension of agential function can arise. There is a large group of words in Greek where the drift of the root *erə-* towards generalization has made a chance confusion doubly confounded. In the suffix *-ήρης* two¹ elements can be found. In such words as *τριήρης*, *τετρήρης*, *ἑξήρης*, *εἰκοστήρης*, etc., the derivation is most probably from *ἐρέσσω* (another grade of the root vowel is seen in the similar compounds *εἰκόσ-ορος*, *πεντηκόντ-ορος*, etc.); in words like *χαλκήρης*, *ποδήρης*, *φρενήρης*, etc., the suffix is most probably from the elemental and widespread root seen in *ἀραρίσκω*, *ἀρηρός*, *ἄρμενος*, *ἄρθμός*, *ἀρετή*, *arma*, *artus*, *ars*, etc., and connotes 'fitted with', 'possessing'. But between these two poles there is a no-man's-land packed with adjectives the true lineage of which cannot be determined. Such are *ἀμφήρης*, *κατήρης*, *μονήρης*, *συνήρης*, *ἐπήρης*, *εὐήρης*, *κωπήρης*, *δνήρης*, *ἀλύρης*, which have been severally referred to *ἐρέσσω* or *ἀραρίσκω* by this or that authority. In most cases it is futile to attempt a decision. Consider *κωπήρης*. It may seem more reasonable at first to dissect this as 'fitted with oars' than, tautologically, as 'oarèd with oars'. But if we remember the tendency to generalize the meaning of the root *erə-*, together with the habit of analogical multiplication,² we have to admit that it is just as probable that the suffix of *κωπήρης* is ultimately referable to the idea of 'rowing'.

The complete insensitiveness of the Greeks in historical times to the root-connexion of *ὑπηρετής* with the sea³ is shown in another way.⁴ The word was reapplied to nautical matters without any incongruity or any ambiguity. *ὑπηρετικόν*, with or without *πλοῖον*, is an ancillary vessel, i.e. a tender or dispatch-boat (Demosthenes, Aeschines, Diod. Siculus): Xenophon has *ὑπηρετικός κέλης* for a ship's cock-boat: the Schol. on Aristophanes *Frogs* 206 calls the Paralus and Salamina *ὑπηρετίδες*, i.e. special state-service vessels.⁵ Again, *ὑπηρετής*, though etymologically a naval word, acquired in later times at least three quasi-technical uses in the vocabulary of soldiers:

¹ I am neglecting a small number of words which are said to have a third origin, viz. to be cognate with *ἥρα* (acc.), e.g. *ἐρίηρος*. Though *ἐρίηρος ἑταῖροι* is used, I find, in connexion with ships in more than half its occurrences in Homer, *ἐρίηρος* is also applied to *δοιδός* (*ter*) and is qualified by *ἐμοί* in *Od.* ix. 555, which effectively disposes of any attractive attempt to take it as 'good at the oar'. But there is much doubt about these words. It is usual, for instance, to connect *θυμάρης* with *ἀραρίσκω* (e.g. by L. & S.⁹), but I should be inclined to relate it to *ἥρα*, cf. the phrase *θυμῷ ἥρα φέροντες*, *Il.* xiv. 132. Boisacq unfortunately does not discuss *θυμάρης*.

² Both principles, generalization and analogical creation, are well illustrated in Greek by the

extensive series of adjectives *σφηκώδης*, *ογκώδης*, *ληρώδης*, etc., formed from *εὐώδης*, 'sweet-scented'.

³ I use 'sea' throughout for 'sea' or 'lake' or 'river', as I refrain from seeking to use the root *erə-* to throw light on the problem of the *Urheimat*.

⁴ Such an oblivion as is shown in (say) the sentence 'he uses a quill for a pen'. It was, in fact, no longer a metaphor, there being, apart from lexicography, no such thing as a 'dead metaphor' (see Stanford's *Greek Metaphor*, pp. 84-5).

⁵ I do not think that it can be argued that this name had any reference to their specially trained crews of crack oarsmen.

(i) 'batman' (sometimes lightly armed); (ii) 'mercenary soldier'; (iii) 'adjutant' or 'aide-de-camp'.¹

The *ὑπηρέτης*, then, never was an 'under-rower' to another rower, as the English compound implies. An undergardener has his place in a hierarchy of gardeners. There is no hierarchy of oarsmen. This note, which I hope is justified both by reason of the commonness of the word at all periods of Greek² and in view of its special sense in the New Testament (where it occurs 20 times and *ὑπηρετέω* thrice³) was written, minor additions excepted, before the appearance of the tenth and final Part of L. & S.⁹ In this the ghostly 'under-rower' has been at last rightly discarded. But there is now no attempt, not even a misleading one, made to account for the *ὑπό*; and a new source of error is introduced by beginning with the gloss 'rower' on the strength of a Dorian inscription from Cos (*SIG*³, 1000, 31).⁴ L. & S., however, adds 'dub. sens.', and a glance at the inscription will show how very doubtful it is. But even if the sense were not in doubt, an inscription of the first century B.C. cannot be made the starting-point of an article on a word which had already passed over to a transferred sense before the time of Herodotus.

To sum up: I suggest that the dictionary definitions should read—*ἐρέτης*, 'an oarsman' (a general term).

ὑπηρέτης, originally, 'a member of an organized team of oarsmen'.

This inquiry has been prompted by a linguistic consideration, viz. the necessity of explaining (i) *ὑπό*, (ii) the disappearance of the literal use, and its method, accordingly, has been linguistic. But this manner of approach is *a priori* and suggestive rather than epideictic and conclusive. Some steps in the argument are speculative, but not, I hope, fanciful. The problem, like many others of greater importance, requires the joint attention of historian and archaeologist, scientist and practical technician. It is for them, ultimately, to write *stet* or *dele* in the philologist's margin.

L. J. D. RICHARDSON

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, CARDIFF.

¹ For a similar transference of a word from one fighting service to another cf. the English word 'crew', which originally meant 'military reinforcements' (*cresco*). Then it was extended to any company of men and has become largely (but not altogether) maritime.

² Of the 30 instances of the four allied forms in Dittenberger's *SIG*² only one has reference to naval matters. This is in No. 129 (Hicks and Hill, 140), where *ὑπηρεταί* is used of the ships'

crews which Spartocus and Paerisades, joint kings of Bosphorus, requested the Athenians to supply (B.C. 346). *ὑπηρεσία* = 'trusty body of attendants' (Tyrrell and Purser) occurs among Cicero's Greek words (*Epp. ad Atticum*, ix. 13).

³ All three peculiar to St. Luke, see Hobart, *Medical Language of St. Luke*, Dublin, 1882, pp. 88-9, 224-5.

⁴ I must express my obligation to Miss Esmée M. Thomas for making this accessible to me.

THE SPARTAN RHETRA IN PLUTARCH *LYCURGUS VI*¹

A. PLUTARCH'S TEXT

(a) *Plutarch's commentary: the corrections τούτως, ἀνταγορίαν*

THE Spartan *Rhetra* quoted by Plutarch in *Lyc.* vi. 2 consists of some thirty-seven words in an archaic Dorian or near-Dorian dialect: Plutarch says it was an oracle, and that later an extra clause was added by the kings Polydoros and Theopompos; he quotes this 'added clause' in vi. 8. I believe this *Rhetra* was not an oracle but an act of the Spartan Ekklesia;² and I suspect that the 'added clause' was not added, but is an integral part of the original act. But for our first objective this opinion matters less than Plutarch's opinion. Our first objective must be to recover Plutarch's text (for his manuscripts are certainly corrupted to some extent): and to do that, we must understand his interpretation.

In Plutarch's view, then, the *Rhetra* is an oracle. He quotes it to show the importance which Lykourgos attached to the Gerousia: '(vi. 1) he laid such stress on this office that he obtained a Delphic response about it (which they call a *Rhetra*): the response is as follows:

(vi. 2) Διὸς Συλλανίου καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς Συλλανίας ἱερὸν ἰδρυσάμενον (mss. -ος) φυλὰς φυλάξαντα καὶ ὠβὰς ὠβάξαντα τριάκοντα γερούσιαν σὺν ἀρχαγέταις καταστήσαντα ὥρας ἐξ ὥρας ἀπελλάζειν μεταξὺ Βαβύκας τε καὶ Κνακίωνος οὕτως εἰσφέρειν τε καὶ ἀφίστασθαι ἡγαμωδᾶν γορίαν ἢ μὴν καὶ κράτος.'

As it stands, or with the usual emendations for the obviously corrupted words in the last clause (e.g. δάμω δὲ τὰν κυρίαν ἤμεν), this cannot be called 'an oracle about the Gerousia': further, it is not easy to find an appropriate subject which can be common to the three infinitives ἀπελλάζειν εἰσφέρειν ἀφίστασθαι. Both these difficulties are met by the corrections which have been proposed for οὕτως: Hermann's καὶ τῶς, Sauppe's αὐτῶς. These both use the Doric form of the accusative plural masculine of the second declension (-ως for -ους): they provide a new subject for εἰσφέρειν and ἀφίστασθαι, and that new subject will be the Gerousia (the '30 men including the 2 kings' mentioned just above). I would propose to do the same by reading τούτως 'the afore-mentioned'. We shall see that Plutarch appears to assume that the subject both of εἰσφέρειν and of ἀφίστασθαι is the Gerousia, so that some such correction is obligatory.

Plutarch's commentary begins by glossing the hard words:

'(vi. 3) φυλὰς φυλάξαι καὶ ὠβὰς ὠβάξαι means to divide the population into certain divisions which he has called φυλαί and ὠβαί. The ἀρχαγέται are the kings. Ἀπελλάζειν means ἐκκλησιάζειν: the term is used because he ascribed the beginning and origin of the constitution to the Pythian God.'

I translate προσηγόρευκεν 'he has called' and ἀνῆψε 'he ascribed', though it is not quite

¹ In citing inscriptions, I have used the abbreviations 'Schwyz.', 'Tod', 'ATL' respectively for Schwyzer, *Dialectorum graecarum exempla epigraphica potiora*, Tod, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, and Meritt, Wade-Gery, and McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists*, vol. i. I am most grateful to Prof. Ed. Fraenkel for the help he has given me on some points of language and grammar.

² Busolt, *Staatskunde*, i, p. 43 (esp. note 1) argues rightly (as I believe) that whereas 'Rhetra' means 'formulation', in Sparta a formulation

only becomes a *Rhetra* through legislative act. He therefore concludes that our document is a 'falschlich als *Rhetra* bezeichneter pythischer Spruch'. I draw the opposite conclusion: it is an act of the assembly, falsely called an oracle. Busolt, *ibid.* 44 note 2, quotes Wackernagel's confirmation of Wilamowitz's opinion, that the dialect cannot be recognized as specifically either Laconian or Delphic. I state here my view, to avoid ambiguity, but without prejudice: see the second part of this paper; meanwhile, cf. Latte in Pauly-Wissowa s.v. 'Orakel', pp. 842, 843.

clear who or what is the subject. Apollo? or rather Lykourgos, who is innocently conceived as having in fact drafted the form of words? I do not think this greatly matters either way (I shall assume it is Lykourgos, as of *ῥέτο* in vi. 5 and *ἔφειτο* in vi. 6): it is more important that Plutarch says nothing of *ἀπέλλα* being Spartan for *ἐκκλησία*: instead, he derives the word *ἀπελλάζειν* from Apollo.

Plutarch next (vi. 4) explains *Βαβύκα* and *Κνακίων*; citing Aristotle's opinion and thus making it clear that Aristotle had commented on this text.¹ He then proceeds (vi. 4) They held the Ekklesia's meetings between these two points, without any porticoes or other special buildings: (vi. 5) for he did not think such things helped wise discussion but rather hindered it, etc. (vi. 6) And when the multitude was assembled, he allowed no one else to propose a motion,² but the *Gerontes and Kings put the motion forward* and the demos had the decisive vote. (vi. 7) Later, however, the multitude twisted the motions *by taking matter away from them and adding matter to them* (*ἀφαιρέσει καὶ προσθέσει*) and violently perverted them, and then the kings Polydoros and Theopompos made the following addition to the Rhetra:

(vi. 8) αἱ δὲ σκολιὰν ὁ δᾶμος ἔροιτο τοὺς πρεσβυγενέας καὶ ἀρχαγέτας ἀποστατήρας εἶμεν.

That is to say, they should not validate [the motion so perverted] but should simply *ἀφίστασθαι* and dismiss the demos, *which was distorting the motion and changing it for the worse.*

It is evident (from the first italicized phrase, in vi. 6) that Plutarch assumes the subject of *εἰσφέρειν* to be the Gerousia. The principle was the same as at Athens: no motion could be proposed from the floor of the house, only the presiding officers could bring a motion forward (*Ath. pol.* xlv. 4: a revolutionary breach of this, *ibid.* xxix. 4, cf. *Thuc.* viii. 67. 2).³ It is further evident (from the second and third italicized phrases, in vi. 7 and vi. 8) that Plutarch conceived the Rhetra as leaving to the Ekklesia wide powers of amendment. It was when these powers were abused (so he believed) that the 'extra clause' was added. This power of amendment does not appear in the Rhetra as the MSS. give it.

The 'extra clause' curtails the power of amendment, or so at least Plutarch thought. How? The Gerousia is to meet a case of excessive⁴ amendment by the procedure *ἀποστατήρας εἶμεν*: Plutarch takes this to mean much the same as *ἀφίστασθαι* in the original Rhetra, and he believes that this involves the dismissal of the meeting. The exact meaning of *ἀφίστασθαι* and *ἀποστατήρ* must be considered later: meanwhile, note that since Plutarch is evidently assuming that the sense of *ἀφίστασθαι* in the original Rhetra is the same as of *ἀποστατήρας εἶμεν* in the 'extra clause', presumably he is assuming that the subject of the verb is the same in both places, namely the Gerousia.

I have kept the manuscripts' *ἔροιτο* in the phrase *αἱ δὲ σκολιὰν ὁ δᾶμος ἔροιτο*. Ehrenberg⁵ has rightly protested against the emendations which displace this word (which is evidently cognate with *ρήτρα*, so that *ρήτραν* can be understood for *σκολιάν* to agree with)⁶ and substitute some form of the quite irrelevant *αἰρέομαι*. Are we to

¹ I am not sure that the lacuna indicated in our texts is essential. 'They now call Babyka-and-Knakion "Oinous", and Aristotle says Knakion is a river and Babyka a bridge.' I leave the localizing of these places to the second part: meanwhile, I suggest that this passage does not compel us to assume that Plutarch drew on a second Rhetra-commentary, besides Aristotle's.

² *Εἰπεῖν γνώμην* is here used in its strict sense 'to propose a motion', as *Thuc.* viii. 68. 1, cf. iii.

49. 1 (where *γνώμαι* means 'proposals' not 'opinions', *rogationes* not *sententiae*).

³ The principle is stated for Sparta in *Plut. Agis* xi. 1.

⁴ 'Excessive' is implied in *σκολιάν*.

⁵ Ehrenberg, *Neugründer*, p. 20 and 125.

⁶ Prof. Fraenkel advises me that we do not need to supply a cognate noun, nor any specific noun, to account for the feminine *σκολιάν*. Wilamowitz on *Eur. Herakles* line 681 explains

suppose that the Gerosia act as *agents provocateurs* and offer 'crooked rhetrai' for the demos to choose? Of course not: the crookedness is not the result of the demos choosing wrong but of its *formulating* wrong. So at least Plutarch understood: ἀφαιρέσει καὶ προσθήσει τὰς γνώμας¹ διαστρεφόντων (vi. 7): ἐκτρέποντα καὶ μεταποιούντα τὴν γνώμην¹ παρὰ τὸ βέλτιστον (vi. 8). There can thus be no question but that Plutarch wrote ἔροιτο (or something like it) and not ἔλοιτο or αἰρέοιτο. If the demos formulates crooked (that is, amends so as to spoil the original intention), the Gerosia is to take some negating action. This does not remove the demos' power of amendment altogether, still less does it remove the power of discussion: the contingency αἰσκολιὰν ἔροιτο is impossible unless both powers remain. Both powers remain: if, on this or that occasion, this results in a case of undue amendment (as we say, an amendment contrary to the preamble), the counter action is prescribed.

How then was the original power formulated? The MSS. give γαμωδὴν γορίαν ἢ μὴν [or γοριᾶν ἢ μὴν or γοριανίμην] καὶ κράτος. No doubt ἢ μὴν is for some form of the infinitive ἤμεν (ἤμην, εἶμεν), and γαμω is for δάμω (or perhaps the genitive δάμω): if δ' is the connecting particle, we are left with ἄν γορίαν. I would restore ἄν<τα>γορίαν,² and write the whole clause thus:

δάμω δ' ἀνταγορίαν ἤμεν καὶ κράτος.

The forms ἀντήγορος ἀντηγορέω ἀντηγορία do not occur (before late Byzantine times),³ but the name Ἀντηγοριῶν (Ἀντεγοριον) is found in Euboea in the sixth or fifth century B.C.⁴

The obstacle to such a reading (it is also the obstacle to taking Plutarch's commentary in this chapter as meaning what it says—the obstacle which has been responsible for the emendations of ἔροιτο into ἔλοιτο, etc.) is Aristotle's statement in *Pol.* ii. 11, § 3 (1273^a12) that the demos at Sparta did *not* possess these powers. I return to this later.⁵

(b) The Text

In the following text I do not seek to restore the original spelling of the inscription (if indeed it was inscribed) but rather the form in which Plutarch (and before him Aristotle?) transcribed it in their Ionic alphabet. Probably they normalized to some extent: for example, the infinitive of the verb to be is written both ἡμην and ἡμεν in a single short (Kretan) inscription of c. 600 B.C.,⁶ and it appears in the Rhetra in the forms ἢ μὴν and εἶμεν: I have, however, written ἤμεν both times, since it is improbable that Aristotle or Plutarch would have cared to preserve any variation:

the feminine article in τὰν Ἑρακλέους καλλίνικον αἰδῶ by supplying αἰδάν from the verb: but after giving some parallels, he adds that many of his instances may be rather instances of the *verwendung des femininum für unbestimmten abstracta* which is common in Greek. See further, to the same effect, Lobeck, *Paralipomena* (1837) p. 363; J. Lohmann, *Genus und Sexus* (1932), p. 17 (I owe these references to Prof. Fraenkel). I feel little competence in this matter: but in our present case, where we have ἔροιτο for the verb, and ῥήτραν is so ready to be supplied, I find it hard to doubt that they are cognate. This means that ἔροιτο (or εἶροιτο?) has nothing to do with the classical ἔρομαι but is the middle voice of the Homeric εἶρω or εἶρω: see below, p. 70 and note 4 *ibid.*

¹ Γνώμας, γνώμην: sc. *rogationes*: see p. 63, n. 2 *supra*.

² Palaeographically, it would seem that the copyist's eye slipped from *T* to *Γ*. The corruption of δάμω to γαμω is harder to explain: but the necessity of restoring some form (or some derivative) of δάμος is absolute, since Plutarch certainly understood the demos to be spoken of in this clause.

³ Ἀντηγορέω is cited in early editions of Liddell and Scott from Theodorus Studita. See below, p. 71, for a suggestion that ἀνταγόρησεν be restored for ἀνταγορέουσεν in Pind. *Pyth.* iv. 156: cf. the equally unique ἐπηγορέω in Hdt. i. 90. 2, preserved in Hesychios but corrupted in all our MSS. to ἐπηγορεύων. [Ἀνταγορίαν is, I hear, suggested by Treu in *Hermes* lxxvi (1941).]

⁴ IG xii, fasc. ix, 56, among the lead tablets (defixiones?) from Styra: Ἀντεγοριον is no. 19.

⁵ See below, pp. 71 f.

⁶ Republished by Ehrenberg in this no. of *C.Q.*

moreo
appea
of δάμ
disapp
but hi
therefo
in κατ
doubt
Βαβύκ

I p
of it e
conver

\$

\$ I

\$ II

Aft
be don
and in
(the G

The
histori
(c)

(d)

(e)

(f)

Plu
sit in t
Aristot
Aristot
ἐκκλησι

¹ I am
βαῦζω, a
Shouting
Lyc. xxvi
βοᾶτιν—
βαῖνγῇ, a
οἰμωγῇ,
-κή unles
αφῆταν in
αφῆταρ il
Meisterha

² Sc. t
is to en
normally
scribed
Solon's k

moreover, in Laconian (or Delphic) as opposed to Kretan script all these forms would appear as *εμεν*. On the other hand, the corruption of *τούτως* to *οὔτως* [and probably of *δάμω* to *γαμω*] shows that they kept the Dorian spelling of *ω* for Attic *ου*: its disappearance in other words (*Συλλανίου*, etc.) is presumably due not to Plutarch but his copyists, who have normalized wherever they could understand. I have therefore restored *ω* throughout: and equally *α* for *η* not only in *Ἀθανᾶς* but also in *καταστάσαντα*: also *ἱαρόν* for *ιερόν*. The *β* in *ὠβάς* is certainly a *digamma*, but no doubt Plutarch wrote it as *β* and I therefore retain it: by the same principle, in *Βαβύκας* both or either may be for *digamma*¹, but I write *β* both times.

I put the 'extra clause' as part (§ III) of the Rhetra: it certainly became part of it eventually. I have divided the earlier part into two clauses (§ I, § II) for convenience of reference.

§ I Διὸς Συλλανίαν καὶ Ἀθανᾶς Συλλανίας ἱαρόν ἰδρυσάμενον (-ος MSS.), φυλάς φυλάξαντα καὶ ὠβάς ὠβάξαντα, τριάκοντα γερωσίαν σὺν ἀρχαγέταις καταστάσαντα,
ὥρας ἐξ ὥρας ἀπελλάζειν μετὰ Βαβύκας τε καὶ Κνακίωνος.

§ II τούτως (οὔτως MSS.) εἰσφέρειν τε καὶ ἀφίστασθαι, δάμω δ' ἀνταγορίαν (γαμωδᾶν γορίαν *vel sim.* MSS.) ἤμεν καὶ κράτος.

§ III αἱ δὲ σκολιὰν ὁ δᾶμος ἔροιτο, τὼς πρεσβυγενέας καὶ ἀρχαγέτας ἀποστατήρας ἤμεν.

After a series of aorist participles (which contain instructions for single acts, to be done once for all), the main purport of the Rhetra is to define the process of legislation,² and in particular to define the respective spheres therein of the probouleutic body (the Gerousia) and of the sovran body (the Ekklesia).

There are certain further questions of interpretation, before we can turn to more historical matters. These are:

- (c) Who is the (unnamed) subject of *ἀπελλάζειν*, and of the aorist participles in the masc. sing. which agree with this subject?
- (d) What does *ἀπελλάζειν* mean?
- (e) What do *ἀφίστασθαι* and *ἀποστατήρ* mean?
- (f) How are we to parse *ἔροιτο*?

(c) *The subject of ἀπελλάζειν*

Plutarch glosses *ἀπελλάζειν* by *ἐκκλησιάζειν*: the latter word means usually 'to sit in the Ekklesia', as in the title of Aristophanes' play *Ἐκκλησιάζουσαι*: this is Aristotle's invariable use in the *Politics*, and since the gloss may well go back to Aristotle, this is relevant. But in *Ἀθ. πολ.* xv. 4 Aristotle says that Peisistratos *ἐκκλησιάζειν ἐπεχειρεῖ*: the meaning is not quite certain,³ but certainly Peisistratos

¹ I am tempted to connect a form *Βαβυκά* with *βαῖζω*, and to understand it as the Bridge of Shouting. Cf. Thuc. i. 87. 2, *κρίνουσι βοῇ*, Plut. *Lyc.* xxvi. 3-4: and Aesch. *Pers.* 574-5, *δυσβάνκτον βοᾶτων—αὐδάν*. *Βαῖζω* could be expected to give *βαῖγῃ*, as *οἰμῶζω* etc. give (or are given by) *οἰμωγῇ*, *ὀλολυγῇ*, *ἰνυγῇ*. I know no such noun in -κῇ unless *ὕλακῇ* be such. For the digamma, cf. *αφταν* in Schwyz. 133 (2) line 3, *αφτο* ib. 760, *αφταρ* ib. app. I. 2, etc.: 'Dittographie zu v', Meisterhans-Schwyz, *Grammatik*², p. 4, n. 15.

² Sc. the *sciscendi ratio*: how the sovran body is to enact its *acta*. Ancient theory did not normally distinguish between *acta* which prescribed regular routine action (like most of Solon's laws) or action in one special situation

(like Solon's amnesty or his *seisachtheia*): both alike were called *νόμος* or *θεσμός* (Solon ap. Plut. *Sol.* xix. 4: the locus classicus is Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 41-3). In Sparta such *acta* were called *ρήτραι*: see the second part of this paper.

³ It presumably means the same as in Diod. xxi. 16. 4 (of Agathokles) *ἐκκλησιάζας τὸν λαόν*, cf. Aen. Tact. ix. 12, sc. *contionem habere*. In the lacuna which follows in Aristotle, Thalheim's supplement [*χρόνον μὲν ἡκκλησιάζειν*] assumes that *ἐκκλησιάζειν* is used here for *δημηγορεῖν*: this is improbable, what we want in the supplement is a statement that Peisistratos lowered his voice (e.g. [*τῆς φωνῆς ἐχάλασεν*] *μικρόν* as Kontos proposed). 'He set about holding an assembly, and rather lowered his voice:

is the subject, so that Lykourgos could be the subject of ἀπελλάζειν. If so, it would probably mean *contionem habere*, 'to convoke the Ekklesia'.¹

There are, I think, only two serious possibilities: either *Lykourgos* is to erect the sanctuary, create or parade the phylai and obai, establish the Gerousia, and then (having done all these things once and for all) at regular intervals and at a set place to *convoke the assembly*: or else the *Spartan demos* is to erect, create, establish, etc., and then at regular intervals, etc., to *sit in assembly*. If, as I believe, the Rhetra is an act of the Spartan assembly, the second must be right: in such an act the unexpressed subject will always be the enacting body itself (as, e.g., invariably in Attic psephismata): any other subject must be expressed. But Plutarch (and Aristotle?) believed that the Rhetra was an oracle delivered to Lykourgos, who was the consultant: and in an oracle, the unexpressed subject is most naturally the consultant. But, e.g., in the prose oracle in Demosthenes xxi. 52 the unexpressed subject is the Athenian demos: and if the consultant is consulting on behalf of his city, he and his city are commonly identified in the answer (e.g. Hdt. vii. 140, 148, *et saepe*).²

We may doubt, then, whether Plutarch thought of Lykourgos as the subject of ἀπελλάζειν: and the sense of ἐκκλησιάζειν which is required if Lykourgos is to be subject is so much the rarer of its two senses that its use in a gloss would be surprising. Still, it is possible (I do not see that this will much affect his interpretation of the whole)—possible, that is, that Plutarch thought so. I am convinced that if he did he was wrong.

(d) *The meaning of ἀπελλάζειν*

There is no good evidence for supposing that ἀπέλλα is Spartan for ἐκκλησία. There is indeed no evidence at all for the singular ἀπέλλα. The plural ἀπέλλαι is glossed by Hesychios as σηκοί, ἐκκλησίοι, ἀρχαιρεσίοι:³ it occurs in two inscriptions of early Roman date from Gytheion in Laconia (ἐδοξε τῶν δαμῶν ἐν ταῖς μεγάλαις ἀπέλλαις, IG. v. 1, 1144²⁰⁻¹, 1146⁴⁰⁻¹), and several times in the great inscription concerning the phratry⁴ of the Labyadaí at Delphi (Schwyz. 323). There we learn that ἀπέλλαι is one of the phratry's θοῖναι [νομμί]οι, like Boukatia, Heraia, etc. (D 2-3): it is a special day, and on that day and no other the Labyadaí have to bring the offerings called ἀπέλλαia (A 30-6). It is a yearly festival, since anyone who fails to bring ἀπέλλαia is instructed to do so τῶν ἡσυχαστῶν ἐτεῖ (A 50-1): the Labyadaí meet and take decisions on that day. To the Labyadaí, in fact (as Nilsson observes, *Gr. Feste*, pp. 464-5), the Apellai is much the same as the Apatouria to an Attic phratry.⁵ It stands first in the list of festivals in D 2-11, just before Boukatia, and comparison with the known list of Delphic months makes it reasonably certain that it fell in the month Ἀπελλαῖος, the first month, Βουκάτιος being the second.

when they said they could not hear, he bade them come up closer, to the Akropolis gate.' The passage is not noticed in Liddell and Scott s.v. ἐκκλησιάζω.

¹ See the passages cited in the previous note.

² The cases I quote are all a good deal later than the presumable date of the Rhetra [or of Lykourgos]: at the earlier date the consultant was no doubt more personal and would get a more personal answer. But I am not concerned with the possibility that it is an oracle, so much as with the question how Plutarch's belief that it was will lead him to understand it. Plutarch, who thought it an oracle, may yet have thought the Spartan demos was the subject of ἀπελλάζειν.

³ Other relevant glosses (the bracketed letters in the lemmata are required by the alphabetic

order): ἀπελ(λ)άζειν: ἐκκλησιάζειν. Λάκωνες, and more surprising, ἀπαλλάζειν: ἐκκλησιάζειν. Ἰωνες: another pair, ἀπέλλακας: ἱερῶν κοινωνοὺς and (ἀπ)άλλακες: ἱερῶν κοινωνοί: and ἀπέλλειν: ἀποκλείειν (see Buck, *Gr. Dial.* § 75).

⁴ I use *phratry* in its Attic sense, for an association comprising more than one Genos. Cf. Pauly-Wissowa s.v. 'Labyadaí', xii. 308, lines 8 ff.

⁵ Nilsson generalizes this and sees in the Apellai the Dorian counterpart of the Ionian Apatouria, occurring wherever the month Apellaios (see next note) occurs. But are we justified in supposing that the Apellai is usually a phratry festival, just because it is so to the Labyadaí? In Tenos the months Ἀπελλαίων and Ἀπατουρίων coexist (IG xii. v. 872). Cf. also p. 67, n. 4.

It
'to ho
with t
in sev
probab

WI
after s
'to ho
Epidau
himself
pray f

'so lon
by year

'at the
one ye
recurring
i. 67. 3
Sparta

ὅτι ἐν π
in the
commo
ἐξ ὧρα
unders

ὧρων ε
becaus

Wi
of the
opening

¹ For
and Ep
Sparta f
(Schwyz
Panamo
the first
Wissowa
Kubitsch
Απολλων
Bechtel
lends co
connexio
merely
inscripti
Λαβυαδα

² IG i
ωραις ἐξ
wished t
MSS. gi
ἐξ ὧρας
are surel
of geniti
ἐκαστον
view of
Vendrye

It looks as if ἀπελλάζειν means 'to hold Apellai' much as, e.g., θεσμοφοριάζειν means 'to hold Thesmophoria'. At least at Delphi, the word ἀπέλλαι is evidently connected with the offerings called ἀπελλαῖα and the month called Ἀπελλαῖος. This month recurs in several calendars, notably at Epidauros, Tenos (in the Ionic form Ἀπελλαῖον), and probably at Sparta, where (as at Delphi) it seems to be the first month of the year.¹

What, then, are we to understand by the phrase ὥρας ἐξ ὥρας ἀπελλάζειν 'season after season to hold apellai'? To the Labyadai, the phrase would presumably mean 'to hold Apellai each successive New Year'. Isyllos, in his famous inscription at Epidauros,² uses our phrase or something like it: he records a decree, proposed by himself, that Epidauros institute a procession to Apollo and Asklepios, which shall pray for their blessing on the Epidaurians

ωραις ἐξ ωραν νομον αἰ τονδε σεβοντας

'so long as they respect this law season after season'. This apparently means 'year by year'.³ So, too, in Aristophanes' *Thesmoph.* 950-1, ἐκ τῶν ὥρων εἰς τὰς ὥρας means 'at the yearly Thesmophoria'. Possibly we should understand the same in the Rhetra: one yearly assembly is guaranteed. But ὥρα does not mean specifically a year; a recurring date if not annual will most likely be monthly. The scholiast on Thucydides i. 67. 3 understands ξύλλογον . . . τὸν εἰωθότα as the regular monthly meeting of the Spartan ekklesia, which he says took place every full moon: τὸν εἰωθότα λέγει ξύλλογον ὅτι ἐν πανσελήνῳ ἐγίγνετο δέ. If he is right and the custom is ancient, then the phrase in the Rhetra should mean 'to meet at the full moon of every month': and so it is commonly understood. But how can this be got out of ἀπελλάζειν? The words ὥρας ἐξ ὥρας cannot, taken by themselves, mean 'every full moon': if that sense is to be understood here, it must be implicit in ἀπελλάζειν. [In Ar. *Thesm.* 950-1, ἐκ τῶν ὥρων εἰς τὰς ὥρας (ξυνεπενυχόμενος) means in effect 'every 11-13 Pyanopsion', but only because ξυνεπενυχόμενος is equivalent to θεσμοφοριάζων.]

With due reserve I would suggest that the 'great apellai' (the μεγάλα ἀπέλλαι of the Gytheion inscriptions) are annual, the apellai of the month Apellaios, at the opening of the year: and that there were 'lesser apellai' in the other months.⁴ If the

¹ For Tenos, see the previous note: for Delphi and Epidauros, n. 4 on this page. It is inferred for Sparta from its occurrence at Herakleia in Italy (Schwyz. 62, lines 2, 95), and further that Panamos (line 101) is there the last and Apellaios the first month of the year: cf. Bischoff in Pauly-Wissowa s.v. 'Kalender': further references, Kubitschek, *ibid.* s.v. 'Apellaios'. If μηνος Ἀπολλωνος in a Delphic inscription (Collitz-Bechtel 1931, line 1) is the same as Apellaios, this lends colour to the view that there is a real connexion between Apellai and Apollo: or is it merely a lapsus? We read in the Labyadai inscription (Schwyz. 323, D 44-5) ται δε θυσια λαβυαδαν τωπελλαῖον μηνος ται Διονυσωι.

² *IG* iv.² fasc. 1, 128. Isyllos writes (line 25) ωραις ἐξ ωραν, and Wilamowitz (*Isyllos*, p. 11) wished to correct the Rhetra accordingly. The MSS. give two genitives in the singular, ὥρας ἐξ ὥρας [not ὥραν, as Wilamowitz implies], and are surely right. The first ὥρας is the same sort of genitive (partitive?) as e.g. Plato, *Phaedo* 58 B ἐκάστου ἔτους θεωρίαν ἀπάξειν. [The 'partitive' view of this kind of genitive is given by Meillet-Vendryes, *Traité de grammaire comparée* (Paris,

1924), p. 509: a different view is taken by, e.g., F. Sommer, *Vergleichende Syntax*, 1921, p. 22 (who compares λοεσσάμενος ποταμοῖο) and Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, ii (1924), pp. 210, 212 ('im Genetiv wird der Bereich gegeben'). I owe these references to Prof. Fraenkel.]

³ Isyllos' law is known only from his verse paraphrase, which gives no date: one naturally assumes the procession is to be annual (rather than monthly or four-yearly). Wilamowitz speaks of 'den alljährlich zu wiederholenden bittgang' (*Isyllos*, p. 10).

⁴ In Epidauros the τελεια αγορα met on the 4th of Apellaios, for appointing the proxenoi and thearodokoi for the coming year (*IG* iv.² fasc. 1, 96): in Delphi, the ενομος εκκλησια met on the 7th or 8th of Apellaios (*Fouilles*, III. vi. 31, ii. 102, 103): these might correspond to the Great Apellai. Ekklesia on the 6th of every month, at Iasos: *BCH* viii. 219, *JHS* viii. 101, ix. 340 (Busolt, *Staatskunde*, 447, note 3). In Chios c. 600 B.C. the Boule demosie met every month τηι τριτηι ἐξ Εβδομαίων: Schwyz. 687 = Tod, *SGHI* 1, B 3-4 [the Ebdomaia are thus a monthly event; in the

Thucydides scholiast is right, the great and lesser apellai are at the full moon (sc. the 14th or 15th of the month). The meetings were surely monthly,¹ and it enhances the scholiast's credit that he knows this. But these scholia (*neque admodum vetusta nec praestantia insignia*, as Stuart Jones writes in the *Praefatio* of his text, p. iv) show little erudition, so that their testimony has not much weight: in better scholia this might well be derived from Aristotle's commentary on the Rhetra in his *Constitution of Sparta*; with these, we cannot feel much confidence. Plutarch connects ἀπελλάζειν with Apollo,² and we know that two monthly dates were marked by sacrifices to Apollo: Herodotus says that on the first and seventh of every month the Spartan kings offered sacrifice to Apollo at the public cost.³

Whether the day of apellai was the New Moon or Full Moon or the Seventh, I see little hope of deciding. But in any case, I submit that 'to apellaze season after season' means the same sort of thing as 'to thesmophorize season after season', viz. to assemble for the [religious?]⁴ occasion called *apellai*; and that the exact date was implicit in the name.

(e) ἀφίστασθαι, ἀποστατήρ

I have said that Plutarch glosses ἀποστατήρας ἡμεν by ἀφίστασθαι, and thus shows that he takes it to mean much the same as ἀφίστασθαι in the phrase εἰσφέρειν τε καὶ

Molpoi inscription from Miletos, Schwyz. 726, line 6, they recur in a very obscure context, but in some connexion with the eighth of the month]: we must, I believe, assume that the Demos has met just previously, on or near the Ebdomaia.

¹ ὥρας ἐξ ὥρας must mean either monthly or yearly.

² Boisacq, *Dict. Étym.* s.v., while exceedingly doubtful about the etymology of ἀπέλλαι, suggests that 'Ἀπέλλων (which he regards as the original form of Ἀπόλλων: it is frequent in Laconian inscriptions) is derived from ἀπέλλαι. [Cf. now *Glotta*, xxvii, p. 32, and *Arch. f. Relig.* xxxii, pp. 142 ff. I owe these references to Dr. Weinstock.] Bechtel, *Hist. Personennamen*, p. 61, gives a number of theophoric names in Ἀπελλ-, e.g. Ἀπελλᾶς, Ἀπελλίκων (from Ἀπελλικέτης; to this Ἀπολλωνικέτης is a good parallel): Ἀπελλαῖος (the Elean victor at Olympia in 540 B.C.) he regards as named from ἀπέλλαι not Ἀπέλλων (p. 523). Cf. the Spartan Πελλῆς in Xen. *Hell.* iv. 3. 23.

³ vi. 57. 2 νεομηνίας δὲ πάσας καὶ ἐβδόμας ἱσταμένου τοῦ μηνὸς διδοσθαι ἐκ τοῦ δημοσίου ἱρήμον τέλειον ἑκατέρω (sc. τῶν βασιλέων) ἐς Ἀπόλλωνος. It is perhaps legitimate to infer *e silentio* that there was not a monthly sacrifice to Apollo at the full moon as well.

⁴ The Greeks had no hard-and-fast division of days, as at Rome, into *fasti*, *nefasti*, *comitiales*, etc. The Boule at Athens is ordered to summon the Ekklesia 'two days after the return of the armed force' and thereafter to have as many consecutive sessions as are needed, and no calendar obstacles are envisaged: IG i². 63 = Tod 66 = ATL A 9, lines 34 ff.: cf. Aeschines ii. 60, iii. 67. In the last instance, Aeschines protests against the disregard of the Dionysia: in the

first, it is likely that the meeting was, in fact, adjourned because of a holiday spirit which had nothing to do with the calendar (Plut. *Nic.* vii. 7 = Theopompos, *Fgr. Hist.* 115 F 92: cf. *AJP* lix. 130). Alkibiades came home on the Plynteria, a *dies nefastus*, ἀποφράς ἡμέρα: the narratives are not quite specific, but it looks as if the Boule and Ekklesia met the same day, though many thought it ominous: Xen. *Hell.* i. 4. 20, Diod. xiii. 69. 1, Plut. *Alcib.* 33. 2. Tribute is fixed at the Great Panathenaia, the allies being then conveniently assembled: IG i². 63 = Tod 66 = ATL A 9, lines 27 ff., IG i². 57 = Tod 61 = ATL D 3, lines 8, 31. There was no doubt a prejudice against public business on such occasions: worst on the ἡμέραι μισαῖ or ἀποφράδες, Plynteria or Anthesteria (Xen. *Hell.* i. 4. 12, Phiotus s.v. μισὰ ἡμέρα and θύραζε Kāres, Suid. s.v. ἀποφράδες ἡμέραι, Athen. 437 C) when the sublunary order stood in precarious balance: the prejudice on other festivals sprang perhaps from the dislike of work, since a festival was a 'holiday' in our sense, cf. the oracle in Dem. xxi. 53, εὐνέειν μίαν ἡμέραν, and the sarcasms of ps.-Xenophon, *Ἀθ. π.* iii. 2 and 8. Yet almost all occasions, in an archaic state, are in some sense religious, and religious business was legitimate, e.g. on the Kronia (Dem. xxvi. 29): the Labyadaí certainly took decisions at their Apellai. On the whole, I would conclude that the monthly apellai was a 'religious occasion' involving a *θυσία* (see previous note), but not a holiday. Cf. Nilsson, *Primitive Time-Reckoning*, ch. xiii. For the monthly Ebdomaia at Chios, see p. 67, n. 4. The connexions of Apollo with the Seventh are well known: Hesiod, *WD* 767, Proklos *ad loc.*, id. *ad Plat. Tim.* 200 CD, 233, Aesch. *Suppl.* 800, Kallim. *Hymn. Del.* 251-5, Plut. *Qu. Gr.* 9.

ἀφίστασθαι. His actual words are

ἀποστατήρας ἦμεν· τοῦτ' ἔστι μὴ κυροῦν ἀλλ' ὅλως ἀφίστασθαι καὶ διαλύειν τὸν δῆμον.

We might understand ἀφίστασθαι καὶ διαλύειν as a pair of synonyms, the former being used to show the connexion with ἀφίστασθαι above, the latter being the unambiguous modern synonym. I think it is possible that this is what Plutarch meant: ἀφίστασθαι is thus nearly (quite?) the same as ἀφίσταναι in the sense of 'to put an end to someone's function' 'to remove from office or function' (e.g. Xen. *Hell.* vii. 1. 45). The Gerousia is instructed, originally, to bring forward the agenda and (after that is finished) to declare the meeting ended: in the added clause, the Gerousia is to close the meeting if it gets out of hand.

Plutarch may have meant that. But Thucydides quotes a Spartan document containing a part of ἀφίστασθαι in a sense which I believe fits our case much more exactly. It is the covering note which the Spartans append to the draft of the Armistice terms in 423 B.C., Thuc. iv. 118. 9.

'The Spartans and allies approve the above terms: but if you have any better or fairer terms to suggest, come to Sparta and tell us: οὐδενὸς γὰρ ἀποστήσονται ὅσα ἂν δίκαια λέγητε οὔτε οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι οὔτε οἱ ξύμμαχοι.'

Here ἀφίστασθαι means 'to decline to entertain a proposal': the parallel is pretty close; in Plutarch's terms, the Spartans and allies have put forward their γνώμη, and now invite the Athenians to make changes (διαστρέφειν or μεταποιεῖν), and they promise they will not ἀφίστασθαι.

I cannot doubt that ἀποστατήρας ἦμεν in § III has the same sense as ἀποστήσονται in Thuc. iv. 118. 9. What of § II εἰσφέρειν τε καὶ ἀφίστασθαι? Plutarch, who thinks § III an addition, supposes the practice of excessive amendment was not originally foreseen; he cannot therefore take ἀφίστασθαι in § II as meaning 'to reject amendments'. Nor can we, even if we think § III part of the original act; § III would be merely tautologous. 'Αφίστασθαι in § II should refer, not to action in the Ekklesia, but to the preliminary probouleutic process: the probouleutic body is 'to bring motions forward and to decline to bring motions forward'. This gives a proper sense to τε καί: the two terms so conjoined must have some specific relation, they may (e.g.) be alternatives: an extreme instance is *Iliad* viii. 167-8

διάνδιχα μερμήριξεν

ἵππους τε στρέψαι καὶ ἐναντίβιον μαχέσασθαι

cf. Aesch. *P.V.* 927 τό τ' ἄρχειν καὶ τὸ δουλεύειν; Sept. 427-8 θεοῦ τε—θέλοντος—καὶ μὴ θέλοντος; Pind. *Ol.* ii. 16; Thuc. v. 111. 5 τυχοῦσάν τε καὶ μὴ κατορθώσασαν. The clause τούτως εἰσφέρειν τε καὶ ἀφίστασθαι expresses the same principle which we find in Plut. *Agis*, xi. 1 τοὺς γέροντας οἷς τὸ κράτος ἦν ἐν τῷ προβουλευέειν: Aristotle is (I believe) consciously paraphrasing it when he writes τοῦ μὲν γὰρ τὸ μὲν προσάγειν τὸ δὲ μὴ προσάγειν πρὸς τὸν δῆμον οἱ βασιλεῖς κύριοι μετὰ τῶν γερόντων (*Pol.* ii. 11, § 5, 1273^a6-8: of Karthage—see below, p. 71).

Plutarch's gloss may then (perhaps) be understood thus: 'ἀποστατήρας ἦμεν: that is, they shall not validate it but simply reject it'. Why, then, does he add καὶ διαλύειν τὸν δῆμον? Does he visualize ἀφίστασθαι as like the act of the judge when he rises from the bench, and the court is adjourned? A cumbrous method of rejection: even if we could believe it was used in the Ekklesia (§ III) it cannot have been in the probouleutic body (§ II). I cannot explain why Plutarch added these words, except by assuming that he understood ἀφίστασθαι as equivalent to διαλύειν (above, p. 68). He must be wrong: the word must surely mean the same in the Rhetra as it does in the Spartan phrase in Thuc. iv. 118. 9; and there the genitive οὐδενὸς makes

¹ I can make nothing of ἡπε νομος ἀποστατο at the end of an early Laconian inscription, *IG* v. 1, 1155 (= Schwyz. 51).

it plain that we have a specialized form of the more common usage ἀφίστασθαι πόνου, κινδύνου, etc. Kyros, seeing himself outflanked both right and left οὐδέν τι μάλλον ἀφίστατο ἀλλ' ὡσαύτως ἡγείτο (Xen. *Cyrop.* vii. 1. 6): all men love virtue ὅτι δὲ διὰ πόνων ἔστι τυχεῖν αὐτῆς οἱ πολλοὶ ἀφίστανται (Xen. *Cyneg.* xii. 18): Kyros *kept to his path*, most men *decline the path* of virtue. The metaphor of the path recurs, I think, in a passage of Pindar where we have something very close to the Spartan usage, *Ol.* i. 52

ἐμοὶ δ' ἄπορα¹ γαστρίμαργον μακάρων τιν' εἰπεῖν· ἀφίσταμαι·

'for me *no road*, to say that a God's belly was ravenous: I *decline that path*'. When a probouleutic council, or the presidents of an assembly, 'decline a path', we should say that they 'rule out of order' a proposal or a trend of discussion. Pindar as poet sees himself doing the same.²

(f) *ἔροιο*

Liddell and Scott quote for *εἶρομαι*, in the sense 'I say', two Homeric passages, *Iliad* i. 513 and *Od.* xi. 542. In both it seems to me that the sense 'I ask' is admissible: in the former, Thetis 'put her question a second time', in the latter the ghosts 'inquired each about the objects of his care'. I can therefore quote no instance of the middle voice of *εἶρω* (*φείρω*) 'I say'. The first person singular of the active is certainly attested; always with hiatus preceding, sc. always *φείρω*: *Od.* ii. 162, xi. 137, xii. 7: but no other part of the present tense, and no part at all of the middle voice.

Ἐροιο in our text has been so regularly emended that Liddell and Scott say nothing of it. Yet I believe it certain we have here some form from the root *φερ* or *φρε*, from which come (apart from *εἶρω* cited above) the tenses *ἔρῳ*, *εἴρηκα*, *εἴρημαι*, *ἔρρηθην*: the adjective *ρήτός*: the nouns *ρήτήρ*, *ρήτωρ*, *ρήμα*, *ρήσις*, *ρήτρα*: the verb *ρήτεύω*:³ the English *word*. The fact that *ἔροιο* is unique should not surprise us: unique forms are not infrequent in pre-classical Greek.⁴ I think it probable that *ἔροιο* is what Plutarch (and Aristotle) wrote, transcribing *φερροιο*: whether they should have transcribed it rather as *εἴροιο*, I do not know: this will not affect the meaning.

The middle voice perhaps deserves more explanation. I have no suggestion, unless possibly it indicated the fact that, while two parties were in question, the one party 'makes its own formulation' (instead of accepting a formula).

(g) *Translation: and Aristotle Pol.* ii. 11, 1273 a 6-13

§ I. [The Spartan people] shall found a sanctuary of Zeus Syllanios and Athana Syllania, shall create [*or* parade?]⁵ the phylai and the obai, shall establish thirty men as a Gerousia including the kings: and [these things being done] shall season after season keep Apellai [*i.e.* assemble on a known day of each month] between Babyka and Knakion.

§ II. The afore-mentioned [Gerontes] shall bring proposals [to the demos] and

¹ This, and the contemporary *Ol.* x. 40, are the earliest appearances of the word *ἀπορος*.

² For *Pyth.* iv. 145, see p. 71, n. 2. Comparable uses of *ἀφίσταμαι* in good Attic: Aesch. *Choeph.* 872, Eur. *Med.* 742, Isokr. viii. 81, iv. 83.

³ In the Argive *ἀρετενε*, *αρητενε* (Schwyz. 85 line 14, 91 line 3, 92 line 2, 96 (1) line 4, 99 line 4, cf. 83 B line 25), the *a-* is usually explained as augment: if so, it presupposes the *nomen agentis* *ρήτας*. This 'Speaker' is the eponymous president of the Argive Boule: he is perhaps the 'formulator', the man who formulates the motions before they are voted on. Alternatively the *ἀ(ρ)ρήτας* (contracted from *ἀνα(ρ)ρήτας*) might

be the 'announcer' of the votes.

⁴ I am most unwilling to correct to *ἔροι* or *εἴροι* (-το being a scribe's dittography before *τοῦς*) or to assume any corruption graver than *ερ-* for *ερ-*. I hope I have made it plain that I am not claiming that the classical verb *εἶρομαι* (cognate with *ἐρωτάω*, *ἔρευνα*) could bear the sense 'I say': rather, that the totally different archaic verb *φείρω* could be used in the middle voice.

⁵ *Φυλάζω*, *ὠβάζω*, formed (like *ἀπελλάζω*) from *φυλά* and *ὠβά*, do not necessarily imply the *creation* of the bodies in question. This clause, vital for the historical context, is discussed in the second part of this paper.

shall decline to bring proposals: the demos shall have the right to criticize [sc. to make counter proposals?] and the final voice.

§ III. And if the demos formulates crooked, the Gerontes and kings shall decline to accept [that formulation].

I have translated ἀνταγορίαν 'the right to criticize'. In the passage of Aristotle which I believe to be practically a paraphrase of our document, the phrase is τῷ βουλομένῳ τοῖς εἰσφερομένοις ἀντειπεῖν ἔξεστιν. I think ἀντειπεῖν (like ἀνταγορίαν) is not merely 'criticize' but (virtually at least) 'make counter proposals': as Pelias does to Jason in Pindar, *Pyth.* iv. 156. [With due reserve, I suggest that in that passage ἀνταγόρευσεν could be corrected to ἀνταγόρησεν:¹ Jason proposed the motion (138 βάλλετο κρηπίδα σοφῶν ἐπέων), Pelias makes his amendment:² ὥς ἄρ' εἶπεν· ἀκᾶ δ' ἀνταγόρησεν καὶ Πελλίας.]

The grave difficulty about the Aristotle passage is this: though it appears to paraphrase the Rhetra closely, it is written not of Sparta but of Karthage: and the ἀντειπεῖν provision especially is stated *not* to hold in Sparta. Aristotle's words are (*Pol.* ii. 11, § 3, 1273^a6):

- (A) τοῦ μὲν γὰρ τὰ μὲν προσάγειν τὰ δὲ μὴ προσάγειν πρὸς τὸν δῆμον οἱ βασιλεῖς κύριοι μετὰ τῶν γερόντων
(B) ἂν ὁμογνωμονῶσι πάντες· εἰ δὲ μὴ, καὶ τούτων ὁ δῆμος·
(C) ἂ δ' ἂν εἰσφέρωσιν οὗτοι οὐ διακοῦσαι μόνον ἀποδιδόασιν τῷ δήμῳ τὰ δόξαντα τοῖς ἄρχουσιν, ἀλλὰ κύριοι κρίνουν εἰσὶ καὶ τῷ βουλομένῳ τοῖς εἰσφερομένοις ἀντειπεῖν ἔξεστιν,
(D) ὅπερ ἐν ταῖς ἑτέραις πολιτείαις οὐκ ἔστιν.

D ante C transponendum esse suspicor, vel (nominibus pronominibusque, necnon μὲν et δέ, leviter immutatis) C ante A.

The divisions, (A) (B) (C) (D), are added by myself for convenience of reference. In (D) the 'other constitutions' are Krete and Sparta, which have been described immediately before: Aristotle treats the three as a group (1272^b26 αὗται γὰρ αἱ πολιτεῖαι τρεῖς ἀλλήλαις τε σύγγενός πως εἰσι καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πολὺ διαφέρουσιν) and particularly remarks on the resemblance of the Karthaginian to the Spartan (1272^b25 μάλιστα δ' ἓνα παραπλησίως τοῖς Λάκωσιν: 1272^b33 ἔχει δὲ παραπλήσια τῇ Λακωνικῇ πολιτείᾳ τὰ μὲν συσσίτια . . . τὴν δὲ τῶν ρδ' ἀρχήν . . . τοὺς δὲ βασιλεῖς καὶ τὴν γερουσίαν—[the two latter with certain advantages over the analogous *Ephors* and *Kings and Council* at Sparta]. Such things as are open to criticism, he adds, are mostly common to all the three [sc. Karthage, Krete, Sparta]: of these things open to criticism, some tend rather towards democracy, others towards oligarchy (1273^a5 τὰ μὲν εἰς δῆμον ἐκκλίνει μάλλον, τὰ δ' εἰς ὀλιγαρχίαν). Then follows our passage [(A) (B) (C) (D)], an example of a too democratic tendency: next comes a too oligarchic feature, the *pentarchiai*.

If my elucidation of the Rhetra is right, then (A) and (C) give an almost exact paraphrase, in a maturer idiom, of the archaic phrases of clause II

τούτως εἰσφέρειν τε καὶ ἀφίστασθαι, δάμω δ' ἀνταγορίαν ἦμεν καὶ κράτος.

Since he is expressly comparing Karthage with Sparta, this is no wonder: he might

¹ Pindar would write *ANTAGOPEZEN*, which might well provoke correction. Cf. *Hdt.* i. 90. 2, quoted in p. 64, n. 3.

² I would emphasize the constitutional idiom in this poem (cf. 110, 153, 265), which has a political aim, as seldom in Pindar: the Sparta-Kyrene connexion through Euphemos is pressed, as well as the further might-have-been connexion (43-51, echoed 254-62, just before the serious politics begin; cf. 22, 175: it recurs in the com-

panion poem *Pyth.* v. 69-81). Here then the words *ἔσομαι τοῖος*: ἀλλά, etc., suggest a formula of amendment (τὰ μὲν ἄλλα, etc.). Note, finally, lines 145-6: if we accept (as both Wilamowitz, *Pindaros*, 388 note 3, and Schroeder, *Pind. Pyth. erklärt*, ad loc., are inclined to) Chairis' emendation ἀφίστανται, we get a good sense from the technical word: Let the Moirai rule it out of order, if kinsmen should quarrel.

well choose to express Karthage in Spartan terms. He has indeed phrased the notion of ἀνταγορία καὶ κράτος in such a way (οὐ διακοῦσαι μόνον ἀποδιδόσαι τῷ δήμῳ . . . ἀλλά, etc.) as to present it as one of the 'democratic lapses from aristocracy' in Karthage: but this by itself will not prove it to be peculiar to Karthage, since he has just said that most of the criticizable features at Karthage (and these are further defined as lapses towards either democracy or oligarchy) are common to all three states. A more serious difficulty is presented by (D). The Rhetra (if I have rightly restored it to the form which Aristotle knew) shows the features described in (C) as existing in Sparta. Nevertheless, in (D), Aristotle *expressly states that this feature* (more particularly ἀνταγορία) *is peculiar to Karthage*.¹

Aristotle is not infallible, and I have long resigned myself to the belief that he made a mistake. [That the Spartan Ekklesia had ἀνταγορία, and that Aristotle knew it had it, I have tried to show above.] But there is an alternative solution which some may prefer, namely to change the order of (A) (B) (C) (D). For example, put (D) before (C): Aristotle will then say

- (A) The Kings-plus-Council have power to bring some measures to the Ekklesia and to refuse others [sc. εἰσφέρειν τε καὶ ἀφίστασθαι]
- (B) if they are unanimous: (if they are not, this power too passes to the demos,
- (D) a feature which we do not find in Krete or Sparta):
- (C) the measures which they do bring are not merely heard by the Ekklesia, but the latter has κράτος and ἀνταγορία.

The feature which now becomes peculiar to Karthage is very remarkable indeed, far more remarkable than ἀνταγορία: it is so far as I know unique. It certainly justifies Aristotle in choosing the Karthaginian legislative procedure, with this most distinctive feature, as that which (distinctively) 'lapsed from aristocracy towards democracy'.

There is still a certain awkwardness in καὶ τούτων (sc. κύριός ἐστιν) in (B). It stands for τοῦ τὰ μὲν προσάγειν, τὰ δὲ μὴ προσάγειν; the two infinitives perhaps explain τούτων (rather than τούτου): but why καί? No other power of the demos has been mentioned yet. This may suggest that in an earlier draft of the whole passage, (B) stood after (C). No mere transposition will restore the earlier draft; I would suppose the order was changed deliberately, and the clauses recast. *Exempli gratia*

- (C) ἃ μὲν γὰρ εἰσφέρουσιν² οἱ βασιλεῖς μετὰ τῶν γερόντων, οὐ διακοῦσαι μόνον, etc. . . . ἔξεστιν.
- (A) τοῦ δὲ τὰ μὲν προσάγειν, etc. . . . πρὸς τὸν δῆμον κύριοι οὗτοι [an *retinendum* οἱ β. κ. μ. τ. γερόντων?]
- (B) ἃν ὁμογνωμονῶσι πάντες· εἰ δὲ μὴ, καὶ τούτων ὁ δῆμος
- (D) ὅπερ ἐν ταῖς ἑτέραις πολιτείαις οὐκ ἔστιν.

If so, the clause which has got displaced is not (D) but (C): and the fault lies not with the copyists, but with Aristotle himself (or his amanuensis, however we may conceive the *Politics* written down). And if so, to seek to restore an order both original and final, may be as chimerical as the attempt to rearrange the order of the books. That need not prevent us recognizing that (D) is inapplicable to (C) but appropriate to (B).

H. T. WADE-GERY.

NEW COLLEGE, OXFORD.

[To be continued]

¹ *Ὅπερ is presumably ἀνταγορία rather than κράτος, sc. refers to καὶ τῷ βουλευμένῳ . . . ἀντεπεῖν ἔξεστιν rather than to [that plus] κύριοι κρίνουν εἰσί.

² The indicative has better MS. authority than the subjunctive.

otion
(etc.)
: but
that
apses
more
it to
ng in
par-

at he
knew
which
, put

lesia

lesia,

d, far
tifies
dis-
wards

ands
plain
been
, (B)
oppose

οὐσαί

ndum

s not
may
both
f the
but
Y.

y than

THE PEOPLE OF ARISTOPHANES

A SOCIOLOGY OF OLD ATTIC COMEDY

By VICTOR EHRENBERG

*Temporary Lecturer in Classics at King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne,
University of Durham, formerly Professor of Ancient History at Prague*

Demy 8vo, cloth, illustrated, 25s. net

BASIL BLACKWELL, BROAD STREET, OXFORD

THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC HISTORY OF THE HELLENISTIC WORLD

By M. ROSTOVITZ

Three volumes

Fully illustrated

£5. 5s. net

Although much has been written on the Hellenistic Age in general, on special questions connected with it, and on the history of parts of the Hellenistic World, no one has hitherto attempted the very difficult and complicated task of writing a comprehensive history of the social and economic development of the various countries which formed that world during the three centuries that followed the death of Alexander the Great

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE HIBBERT JOURNAL

A Quarterly Review of Religion, Theology, and Philosophy

Edited by L. P. JACKS

April 1943 Contents

1. MAN THE TRUSTEE OF THE MORAL ORDER. Julian Huxley
2. A NEW REFORMATION. Dr. W. R. Inge
3. NATURAL SELECTION AND THE LESSER PEOPLES. The late Dr. R. R. Marett
4. WHAT HOPE OF LIFE AFTER DEATH? E. W. Adams, M.D.
5. THE SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE FOR SURVIVAL. G. N. M. Tyrrell
6. EDUCATION THE UNIFYING FORCE OF CIVILIZATION. Dr. Maxwell Garnett
7. ULYSSES IN HELL. Sir William Munday
8. A TEACHER'S PLEA FOR AN ENLARGED PSYCHOLOGY. Eleanor Slaby
9. THE NOTION OF DESERT, BAD AND GOOD. The Rev. Dr. H. H. Farmer
10. SIR FRANCIS YOUNGHUSBAND. Lady Lees
11. SURVEY OF RECENT PHILOSOPHICAL AND THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE. S. H. Mellone

Reviews

SUBSCRIPTION: TEN SHILLINGS NET PER ANNUM, POST FREE

Apply for free specimen copy

GEORGE ALLEN AND UNWIN LIMITED

40 MUSEUM ST., LONDON WC1

